Good Governance Project (GGP)
Phase IV 2009-2012

EXTERNAL REVIEW

March 23, 2011

Gabriele Ferrazzi
Arun Dhoj Adhikary

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

<u>Introduction</u>

1.   The Good Governance Project (GGP) is in its fourth phase of a long partnership between Pro Public, a well regarded Nepali civil society organization, and Switzerland, through the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC). The current phase runs from March 2009 to February 2012, with a budget of CHF 1,220,000. Based in Kathmandu, GGP operates in the "Swiss cluster districts"; Dolakha, Ramechhap, Okhaldunga and Khotang in the east and Dailekh and Jajarkot in the west.

1.   The External Review Team (ERT) has been asked to undertake a review of the GGP to assess the achievements of the GGP in terms of its relevance, effectiveness and sustainability in achieving SDC's strategic outcomes, and to make recommendations to SDC on how it can continue governance support activities in future. The ER was undertaken over the period March 3-23, through meetings with Kathmandu based stakeholders as well as visits to three districts. In these field visits, district and village officials, Good Governance Clubs District Coordination Committee (GGCDCC), Good Governance Clubs (GGC), DAG and other stakeholders were met.

<u>Key Findings on Outcomes</u>

2.   The GGP has sought to adopt a results based management approach, but shortcomings in the baseline, Logical Planning Matrix, and data gathering hampers this approach; the ERT has therefore based its observations and conclusions largely on its field work. It has come to the following conclusions on outputs and outcome achievement:

3.   Outcome 1 ***"People, in particular the disadvantaged, are capable to claim benefit from development interventions"*** is being achieved in a meaningful way, through the achievements in Output 1.1 and 1.3, where information is being provided to citizens and government officials on the government guidelines concerning service rights of citizens, particularly DAG. The use of the Public Hearings, skilfully facilitated by GGP staff, has also proved instrumental to this outcome achievement. The ERT has heard directly from stakeholders of their acceptance of the PH methodology and work of the GGP in general. VDC level stakeholders in particular have noted a more assertive public, e.g., on allocations. DAG have explained to the ERT that they are more comfortable en with officials and better able to make claims on their rights to funds and services. The ERT notes that DA and women's participation in social accountability events are significant and improving. However, in two VDCs visited by the ERT, few women came to the otherwise well attended meetings, and they were reluctant to speak initially.

4.   The ERT notes that the current success of GGP has built on prior GGP efforts and other initiatives. Moreover, it finds that the emphasis on interpreting/sharing information through direct means (e.g., orientations or PH) are more determining than through media activities of GGP. The ERT also adds a cautionary note, that post GGP the increased knowledge may not be enough; citizens may need to be further supported/linked with social mobilization (SM) to make use of their new knowledge.

5.   Outcome 2 *"Local Government Offices and service providers are accountable to people"* has also been attained to some degree. A wide range of governance and service related issues have been raised in the Public Hearings. Officials have recognized the value of GGP facilitation, and now have a more vigilant stance toward the implementation of guidelines governing allocations and service delivery.   However, the ERT notes the difficulty of stakeholders to identify services that have been improved. The "supply side" effort, a new feature of this phase of GGP, has been narrowly defined, and inputs are of low intensity and ad hoc. This has worked to limit the potential achievement of this outcome. It is also necessary to allow several cycles of social accountability tool application before assessing if the government response is genuine or simply formulaic/perfunctory.   Proper tracking of government commitment (e.g., declaration), a task not well done yet in GGP, is of the utmost importance, and this brings the issue back to the degree of social capital found/generated in the locality. Only cohesive groups stand a chance of maintaining pressure on government to deliver on their commitments.

6.   It is also important to not lose sight of the fact that User Groups "self-servicing" is the predominant form of expenditures of local bodies, particularly for the VDC level. This reality has been neglected in the GGP. The PA tool, and selecting the UG versus contracting modality are two aspects needing attention. If the contracting modality is to be given attention, procurement processes may be a good entry point.

Relevance and Sustainability

7.   The work of GGP is highly relevant, reflecting the lessons learned in local governance in Nepal and elsewhere over the last two decades. Supporting disadvantaged citizens to claim services is vital, and supporting government units at the local level to deliver services effectively is equally important. However, GGP has only taken up a thin slice of the "supply side" of service delivery; providing information that complements the demand side support (e.g., increasing officials' understanding of their roles in Public Hearings and enhancing their grasp of guidelines and service standards). While GGP was able to straddle the demand and supply side in this configuration, a deeper involvement in the extensive supply side issues affecting service delivery would require GGP/Pro Public to acquire greater technical skills relating to the service delivery process and structures.

8.   The social accountability tools applied by GGP are on the whole well accepted by all stakeholders, including government. The hard work and evident dedication of GGP staff, and Pro Public "stamp," are some reasons for this receptivity. However, there needs to be a better appreciation in GGP of what it means to institutionalize these tools within government. It is important to anticipate the various sponsors and scenarios for the tools' application. GGP should be testing the tools in a purposeful manner to provide nuanced guidance for these scenarios. This will require greater rigor in capacity development strategies and in gleaning lessons from application, developing manuals and packaging these for the wider community of practice.

9.   Related to the above point, GGP will need to give more attention to its exit/sustainability strategy. The phasing-out of past districts appears to be driven by considerations of the broader SDC portfolio, rather than the maturity of GGP activities and readiness of local actors to carry on with key initiatives. Sharper strategies and greater efforts are needed to nurture or

bolster local actors, such as the Good Governance Clubs (GGCs) to take on the role now played by the GGP, which tends to be a "doer" rather than a developer of local capacities.

Pro Public internal governance

The ERT believes that internal struggles in the Pro Public board/management has limited the success of GGP, distracting the leadership/management of Pro Public and GGP from strategic issues and creating a tense work atmosphere. As a result, Pro Public/GGP have missed opportunities to get the most out of GGP and to better project their influence and roles at national and local level. In particular, the GGCs have been allowed to deteriorate rapidly nationwide. The clubs feel that they have been abandoned. Their dormant state, or insufficiently enhanced skills, undermines the sustainability of GGP efforts.

The way forward

GGP needs to focus its activities to maximize capacity developments of local actors, undertake proper knowledge management and increase the chances of sustainability. It will need more time to do this than the remaining 11 months of Phase IV. But the ERT is reluctant to recommend a new phase in view of the current internal governance challenges facing Pro Public/GGP; that would represent too high a risk for SDC. Hence it is recommending a one year extension, with clear conditionalities on program focus and internal governance reforms. The conditionalities pertaining to internal governance reforms should echo the most useful recommendations made by the reform committees of the Pro Public board. Hence, the ERT recommendations are:

1. Reorient the third year of GGP IV to address the important work that remains to be done (see previous list), and continue that work into the extension year.
   a) Public Hearing and Citizen Report Card methodologies need to be purposefully tested, refined and packaged for dissemination
   b) The PH methodology needs to be explored for its potential for institutionalization (in government)
   c) The status, capabilities, and intentions of the good governance clubs/DCCs need to be ascertained as it appears they have seriously deteriorated.

2. Undertake Pro Public governance changes as follows:
   a) Recruit an Executive Director that is full time and can credibly manage Pro Public (by June 2011)
   b) Ensure the new Executive Director will provide the guidance and checks and balances on GGP that would normally come from such a position (reflected in Job Description, June 2011)
   c) Place the new Executive Director on the GGP Steering Committee (July 2011)

While the remaining work may not be fully finished in the extension year, it is hoped that toward the end of that period Pro Public will be in a better position to renew its partnership with SDC.

For SDC, some of the refocused and new activities suggested for the GGP should generate new ideas for entry points, partners and modalities for both demand and supply side dimensions of local service delivery.

Content

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

APM	All Party Mechanism
ADB	Asian Development Bank
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CD	Capacity Development
CDO	Chief district Officer
CAC	Citizen Awareness Centre
CF	Citizen Forum
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CCU	Cluster Coordination Unit
CBO	Community Based Organization
DAG	Disadvantaged Group
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
D/LG	Decentralization/Local Governance
DDC	District Development Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
DP	Development Partner
ER	External Review
ERT	External Review Team
GE/SI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GGA	Good Governance Act
GGC	Good Governance Club
GGCDCC	Good Governance Clubs District Coordination Committee
GGP	Good Governance Project
GoN	Government of Nepal
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit
INGO	International Non-Government Organization
LBs	Local Bodies
LDO	Local Development Officer
LGAF	Local Governance and Accountability Facility
LGCDP	Local Governance and Community Development Programme
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MLD	Ministry of Local Development
NGO	Non Government Organisation
PRAN	Program for Accountability in Nepal
PD	Programme Document
PM	Performance Measure
PASRA	Poverty Alleviation in Selected Rural Areas
PA	Public Audit
PH	Public Hearing
RTI	Right to Information Act
SMC	School Management Committee
SA	Social Accountability
SM	Social Mobilization
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
ToR	Terms of Reference

UC	User Committee
UG	User Group
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VDC	Village Development Committee
YOP	Yearly Operational Plan

Introduction

2.   The Good Governance Project is in its fourth phase of a long partnership between Pro Public, a well regarded Nepali civil society organization, and Switzerland, through the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC). The partnership began in 1999, and the current phase runs from March 2009 to February 2012, with a budget of CHF 1,220,000. Based in Kathmandu, GGP operates in the "Swiss cluster districts"; Dolakha, Ramechhap, Okhaldunga and Khotang in the east and Dailekh and Jajarkot in the west.

3.   The international and national consultants forming the External Review Team (ERT) have been asked to undertake a review of the GGP.   The purpose of this external review is to assess the achievements of the GGP and to make recommendations to SDC on how it can continue governance support activities in future.

4.   The GGP was conceived from the start as the last phase of the current series. Building on the other phases, it seeks to bring about the following outcomes:

---

i.   People, in particular the disadvantaged, are capable to claim benefit from development interventions

ii.   Local Government Offices and service providers are accountable to people

---

5.   The External Review (ER) terms of reference (Appendix 1) direct the Consultants to address the following issues:

   a. The organisational strength vis-à-vis the changes in the project's priorities (made in Phase IV)
   b. Internal Governance (in GGP/Pro Public)
   c. Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability
   d. Looking forward, beyond this phase – SDC's future support

10.   The ER was undertaken through meetings in Kathmandu based stakeholders as well as visits to two districts, where district and village officials, Good Governance Clubs District Coordination Committees (GGCDCCs), Good Governance Clubs (GGCs), DAG and other stakeholders were met.

11.   The ER report explains the methodological approach to the ER, and then presents evidence of achievement against the two project outcomes. It provides judgements on the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of these achievements and the prospects for results achievement by the end of the project. The report then examines project management and comments on the organizational capacity of GGP/Pro Public to pursue the goal espoused of GGP. Finally, recommendations are provided on how to conclude the GGP, and how to proceed with future SDC support in the area of good governance in Nepal.

1. Methodology of the External Review

1.1.   Use of the GGP Logic model/Performance Measurement Framework

12.   The ERT examined and made some use of the Results-Based Logical Planning Matrix (LPM) of GGP (found in Appendix 2), which was revised in February 2010, with its final form found in a document dated June 13, 2010. The baseline for the LPM, conducted as one of the first activities of GGP, was unfortunately not guided by the LPM, and is therefore not used to assess progress in this report. The detailed and complete progress of the Project over the first two years was also not fully captured in GGP reports in time for the ER. Hence the ERT has had to rely largely on its field work.

13.   As the baseline is usually the document that contains operational definitions for the LPM, the Project has essentially operated without common operational definitions of the indicators used to report on progress. Perhaps to get around the need to impart a common view of the indicators, the Project has required District Coordinators to send raw data or tabulated participation data (categorized under dalits/janjatis/male/female categories) to the GGP headquarters for further processing. Hence the most reliable data has to do with DAG participation in GGP orientation/training events. The tracking of other output and outcome indicators has been problematic. Coordinators have submitted data from an "exit" survey of service users to GGP HQs, where it was fashioned in a report that will form the basis of the Citizen Report Card forum in the district. But this data is also not compatible with the LPM, and it is unlikely to form the baseline for later comparisons.

14.   There are fundamental issues of validity and feasibility for some of the LPM indicators. Some comment will be made on some of these issues, and where appropriate, the LPM figures that are most reliable are used to supplement the observations of the ERT.

1.2.   Methods of data collection and analysis

15.   The ERT applied the following methods of data collection and analysis:

  i.   Desk review of relevant documents of the project and SDC (see list used in Appendix 4)
  ii.   Discussions with GoN/LGCDP/LGAF officials
  iii.   Interviews with key stakeholders, partners, target beneficiaries including GGC District Coordination Committees, GGP staff in districts, civil society and local government bodies (VDCs & DDC) and line agencies particularly CDO, DADO, and DEO and also with the project management and Pro Public. (see list in Appendix 6)
  iv.   Interviews with other donors and projects – DANIDA, World Bank PRAN, LGAF, PASRA (GIZ)
  v.   Analysis of data, information and report writing
  vi.   Briefing on findings and recommendations at SDC Kathmandu

1.3.   District visits

16.   The Project is operating in six Swiss cluster district. Two districts were selected for the comprehensive field visits; Ramechhap, in the east, and Dailekh in the west. As the Coordinator for Dailekh was also the coordinator for Jajarkot, some impressions were also gained from this district's experiences. Dolakha district (Charikot) was also visited, but only to obtain viewpoints

on the phasing-out from the GGP, from the GGP staff, GGCDCC and key district officials (CDO, LDO). The ERT had the good fortune of being able to stop in Nepalgunj as well, to discuss the GGCDCC/GGCs with the local GGCDCC chair.

1.4. Schedule of the ER

17. The schedule of the ER is shown below:

- Start of assignment/briefings: 3rd March
- Meetings with Pro Public and GGP in KTM: 4th
- Field visit to Dailekh district/VDCs: 5th - 9th March
- Interviews in KTM: 10th -11th March
- Field visit to Ramechhap and Dolakha districts/VDCs: 12th -16th March
- Analysis/report writing: 17th-19th March
- Debriefing, editing, and finalization of report: 20th -23rd March

18. A daily schedule, showing key meetings and activities, is shown in Appendix 5.

2. Context of the GGP Phase IV

19.   The SDC has had a long association with Pro Public through the GGP, beginning in 2000. This support played initially to Pro Public's strengths, the core being national level policy advocacy, backed up by judicial activism where necessary. Over time, the focus of the partnership shifted as new governance challenges emerged. Human rights, anti-corruption, and conflict management were added in a changing mix. A notable development in the early years of GGP was the supported as well as spontaneous creation of radio listeners' clubs on good governance, which later became the Good Governance Clubs. The GGP believes that there are about 6,000 clubs now operating, with a membership of about 60,000. The focus of the clubs has been anti-corruption campaigns, but some have diversified their activities.

20.   Another development of note in the early years of GGP was the pioneering of the public hearing (PH), initially launched for national level issues and audiences. It is fair to say that this tool has greatly helped to place Pro Public/GGP on the map. The skilful application of the tool has garnered it much visibility and respect among both civil society and government.

21.   While the substantive focus of SDC support in the four phases has remained largely within the core strengths of Pro Public, over time the SDC partnership shifted the focus of activities to the district level, limiting them to the Swiss cluster districts that were the locus of SDC project interventions (cutting across various sectors). This narrowing of geographic scope began in the third phase (to 17 districts initially) and continued into Phase IV, where support was reduced to six districts.

22.   Notwithstanding the shift noted above, Phase IV of GGP was remarkable above all for its attempt to enlarge the scope of its support. It shifted from solely nurturing demand for good governance in civil society, to balancing this with support to local bodies (LBs) to supply the demanded services in effective, responsive and accountable ways. The pioneering development and application of public hearing, public audits and other tools for claiming good governance and services from the government had been deemed successful in prior phases, but the capacity of the LBs to respond adequately had evidently not kept pace. In fact, as Phase IV was being designed, there was a consensus in Nepal that in some respects service delivery had been eroded over the last decade, primarily due to the conflict.

23. Covering both sides of service delivery meant that Pro Public was being stretched somewhat beyond its "traditional" mandate.   There are indications from GGP's Phase IV experience that gaining the support of government is not always easy, particularly when simultaneously supporting actors that are critical of government. Whether SDC should be supporting an NGO to stretch itself over both dimensions is an issue under discussion within SDC, echoing debates in other countries.

24. Pro Public was also asked to shift its locus of activity from national to just a few districts. As well, Good Government Clubs were no longer the primary focus of the project; the Local Action Fund that had been directed to them in earlier phases was dropped. Over the life of GGP Phase IV, the phasing out of Dholakha district was also anticipated (in late 2010, with an administrative wrap up period of six additional months).

25.   There were mixed feelings within Pro Public about the appropriateness of the described Phase IV shifts, in view of the skill set and modus operandi of Pro Public. It appears to the ERT that the enthusiasm and influence of the GGP project director was a major factor in Pro Public's decision to take on the Phase IV challenges, despite some concerns about its focus.

26.   A degree of uncertainty about Pro Public's commitment and capacity was evident on the SDC side. While acknowledging the successes of previous phases, SDC was guided by the SDC 2009-2012 Strategy for Nepal, indicating a need to engage with government. Just prior to Phase IV, it had become a partner in the LGCDP, a multi-donor funded effort of the government of Nepal (GoN), initiated in 2008. This program sought to address both the demand and supply side of service delivery. It was clear to SDC Nepal that in its future work it needed to more effectively link the demand and supply side. It was not so clear that Pro Public was the best vehicle to achieve that aim - because of the core strengths of Pro Public but also because of persistent and troubling internal governance weaknesses within Pro Public, particularly in relation to the execution of GGP. These sentiments explain the rather ambivalent position of SDC in designing Phase IV, and the rather inauspicious statement in the Phase IV project document that Phase IV would be the end of SDC support for GGP.

27.   Regardless of the vehicle to be chosen, it is clear that SDC intends to continue supporting good governance in Nepal. Even so, in recent times the demand side has become more crowded. GIZ will continue to undertake social mobilization after its support for Poverty Alleviation in Selected Rural Areas (PASRA) ends; the new effort will be subsumed within its revamped programming for subnational government. The World Bank has joined the scene recently with its Program for Accountability in Nepal (PRAN). Moreover, the Local Governance and Accountability Facility (LGAF), the complement to the Local Governance and Community Development Program (LGCDP), is now becoming operational. Future SDC programming will therefore need to take these efforts into account.

3. Progress toward GGP Phase IV outputs and outcomes

3.1. Project activities and division of labour

28. The GGP spans districts located in two regions of Nepal, with its GGP HQs in Kathmandu situated between the western and eastern districts. The GGP is rather centralized in its delivery. The HQs produces most of the media products, and airs/distributes these itself nationally. It also undertakes some of the training, in PH in particular. It processes CRC data and takes the lead in presenting it back to the stakeholders in the respective districts. Moreover, it requests data from district coordinators (DCs), so as to assess progress in terms of Project outputs and outcomes.

29. The districts take on the remaining activities. For the first two years of GGP, Table 1 presents the level of effort undertaken under each main activity heading for each district. In view of the challenges of a dispersed and hard to reach VDCs, it is remarkable that the GGP staff in the field has been able to deliver what it does and to establish good relationships with many stakeholders. It is evident however that the workload stretches the GGP staff in the field to the point where they cannot adequately undertake the needed documentation, monitoring and reporting on activities and results. Also, the capacity development of GGP field staff has been minimal, necessitating considerable centralization of some activities. Of course, such centralization has the effect of perpetuating itself if there is not enough investment in field staff upgrading.

30. The ERT also notes that GGP staff are "doers" in many important activities that in the long term might be expected to be done by local actors. In other words, and perhaps because of the work load, it fails to maximize the opportunities for local actors to grow into their roles.

3.2. Comments on the LPM and monitoring efforts

31. As GGP is committed to a results based approach in Phase IV, it is important for the monitoring system to move beyond activities. The previous external review (2005) faulted the GGP for not being serious about monitoring outputs and outcomes. It is commendable then that GGP has in this phase sought to be more rigorous in setting indicators and tracking performance. GGP staff admitted that this was a difficult effort. The ERT appreciates that it is an arduous learning process for any project to develop and implement a sound results-based performance measurement framework, but the investment is usually worthwhile. GGP may have underinvested.

32. It is regretful that the observations on output and outcome achievement made in this report could not draw extensively from the monitoring effort of GGP (centred on the Logical Planning Matrix). The first drawback of the GGP performance measurement system is that the baseline indicators were not made compatible with the LPM indicators. Secondly, some indicators in the LPM lack validity. Lastly, some have data demands that are not possible to meet by GGP, or data collected is useful in fulfilling different indicators than those found in the LPM.

33. According to the GGP, the baseline document was prepared in 2009, but was only submitted just prior to the start of the ER. However, the GGP indicated that the data has been available for some time, and was used as the baseline in recent monitoring reports.

Table 1: Activities undertaken in first two years of Phase IV – by district (provided by GGP)

Activities	Dholakha	Ramechhap	Okhaldunga	Khotang	Dailekh	Jajarkot
Application of social accountability (SA) tools	2 PHs by DDC 7 PHs by VDC	2 PHs by DDC 8 PHs by VDCs	1 PH by DDC 5 PHs by VDC	2 PHs by DDC 4 PHs by VDC	1 PH DDC 6 PH VDC	1 PH by DDC 6 PHs by VDC
PH/PA & CRC conducted by the Project	12 PHs 2 PAs 1 CRC	19 PHs 2 PAs 1 CRC	16 PHs PAs 1 CRC	18 PHs 2 PAs 1 CRC	18 PHs 2 PAs 1 CRC	19 PHs 2 PAs 1 CRC
Monitoring of PH declarations	Local Monitoring System in Place	Local Monitoring System in Place	Local Monitoring System in Place	Local Monitoring System in Place	Local Monitoring System in Place	Local Monitoring System in Place
Training on GGC, youth/CSOs UCs etc. on SA tools	25 Participants PH/PA & CRC tools 25 VDCs covered	57 Participants PH/PA & CRC tools 25 VDCs covered	65 Participants PH/PA & CRC tools 25 VDCs covered	51Participants PH/PA&CRC tools 25 VDCs covered	31 Participants PH/PA & CRC tools 10 VDCs covered	37 Participants PH/PA & CRC tools 10 VDCs covered
Proposal writing training to DAG at VDC level	148 Participants 117 DAG proportion 70 Women proportion	587 Participants 480 DAG proportion 345 Women proportion	545 Participants 446 DAG proportion 331 women proportion	796 Participants 690 DAG proportion 471 Women proportion	487 Participants 326 DAG proportion 255 Women proportion	581 Participants 308 DAG proportion 273 women proportion
Training on GG and service delivery standards	80 Participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered	115 Participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered	127 Participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered	157 Participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered	53 participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered	39 participants DAO, DDC, DEO, DHO, ADDO, VDCs & Political Parties representatives covered
Door to door distribution of service rights pamphlet	1,124 Households reached	3,375 Households reached	3375 Households reached	3302 Households reached	2,250 Households reached	2,250 Households reached
Radio broadcasts of GG Program at district level	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district	36 episodes of broadcasts aired by GGP in district
Programs produced by district team and aired by FM radios	104 Episodes in the last two years	None	23 Episodes	13 Episodes	None	None
Workshops to explain or monitor LGCDP	2 DDC events 11 VDC events	1 DDC events 12 VDC events	1 DDC events 9 VDC events	1 DDC events 9 VDC events	2 DDC events 14 VDC events	1 DDC events 11 VDC events

34. The ERT has examined the baselines document, and found it does not provide suitable data for the LPM indicators; it frames its own indicators, which sometimes come close to those in the LPM, but are nonetheless not useful to the GGP performance measurement system. Appendix 7 provides specific comments on the weakness of the (undated) baseline report.

35. Despite the lack of a timely and suitable baseline, GGP could have established a "trajectory" of indicator achievement through regular measurements against the LPM indicators. However, as Appendix 3 shows, many of the LPM indicators are problematic, conceptually, and also in practical terms; there is no internal guide in GGP that makes the indicators operational, that would allow everyone within the organization involved in monitoring to understand what the indicator means, the data it entails, and how this data needs to be collected and processed.

36. Additionally, some of the indicators lack validity; they are not a reasonable proxy for the change that is intended. Those relating to the padlocking/unrest that result in service disruption are a case in point. It is also doubtful in cases whether the outputs selected are sufficient to indicate significant changes at the outcome level. Additionally, some outputs also appear to be outcomes, involving the contribution of other actors, raising the issue of GGP attribution.

37. In other cases, the feasibility of obtaining reliable data for the indicators is overwhelming, for a project like GGP. What has been collected so far is not suitable, or leads to measures that are different from what is stated in the LPM. GGP staff have explained to the ERT that some of these challenges have been acknowledged and discussed, with SDC as well, leading to some decisions to drop or change certain indicators. However, the reporting continues as in the past, with erroneous or misleading data offered to the reader of the reports.

38. Because of the stated problems with the LPM system, limited use can be made of the progress/monitoring reports. This meant that the ERT relied primarily on the more qualitative observations derived from field work and from interviews with Kathmandu actors.

3.3. Achievements under Outcome 1: "Claiming"

39. **Output 1.1 "People are aware of government programs and service standards:"** While not measured in accordance with the LPM, several observations provide evidence that this output is being met in a meaningful way. The orientation/training activities that have been undertaken in the districts/VDCs are largely about interpreting national guidelines on allocations and service entitlements. Additionally, several thousand DAG households were visited to make a brief introduction to a pamphlet describing local services. Citizens attending the ERT gatherings claim that they now know what services are being provided and that they have certain rights to receive these. Table 1 shows that some events had good DAG and women participation rates. The ERT does note however that in two VDC gatherings atttended by the ERT, women were scarces, and initially reluctant to talk.

40. **Output 1.2 "People are sensitized of civic rights and responsibilities toward the state and society:"** This rather vague output relates to the effort to avoid social unrest (padlocking, strikes etc.). It is unlikely to be met since the only activity related to it is GGP HQs radio broadcasts (nationally). The project document indicated that there would be some meetings in the districts to discuss the obligations of groups toward the state and society – leading to, it was hoped, a reduction in the undesired forms of unrest. These meetings did not seem to be held in Ramechhap (only one such meeting was held; but that was in Phase III). In

any case, the assumption that these activities would have the anticipated effect is questionable (in view of the many variables that give rise to such unrest), and the desire to reduce such incidents is dubious in the first place. It could be equally claimed that making people more aware of their civil rights might well lead to such unrest – as a healthy expression of resistance to the denial of those rights.

41.   **Output 1.3 "Local youths, clubs and user group members have knowledge about the application of GG advocacy and monitoring tools:"** The training provided for these target groups was rather short (2 days), and was not followed up. It is not known what the participants did with their training, aside from GGC members who were enlisted to support PH activities in selected focus VDCs. Only one person from each GGP-focus-VDC was trained, limiting the growth of a critical mass in each VDC; this training will not likely have fortified the dormant or struggling GGCs.

42.   **Output 1.4 "Discriminated groups are aware of the constitution making process:"** The activities related to this output were postponed to the third year, and in the view of the ERT it could have been excluded altogether, for the practical reason of the lateness of the Constituent Assembly work on the Constitution, but also because the activity is peripheral to the issue of local demand/supply of services.

43.   **Outcome 1 "People, in particular the disadvantaged, are capable to claim benefit from development interventions."**

44.   As an overall assessment of this outcome achievement, the ERT believes that GGP activities are indeed increasing citizen (particularly DAG) demand. This has been achieved largely through the significant attainment of Outputs 1.1 and 1.3. VDC secretaries have related to the ERT the more intensive claims made on the budget, and some DAG have explained that they would never have set foot in the VDC or other offices or gatherings to claim services or the portion of the budgets due to them, without the information, encouragement, and forums arranged through GGP.

45.   This new confidence and assertiveness has come about in part through the efforts of Phase IV activities, though it is likely that previous GGP phases, and other social mobilization efforts, made a contribution. In any case, the GGP has undertaken useful activities; it provided information (on guidelines), indicated where claims could be made (e.g., via household visits/distribution of pamphlets) and provided forums for civil society for interaction with government and forums where accountability could be demanded (Public Hearings).

46.   A lesser role was played by GGP packaged media. GGP HQs produces most of the media products, and airs/distributes these itself nationally. These appear to bring only limited benefits to the focus districts. Citizen and coordinator responses indicated that the very vital activity of providing citizens with information happens most effectively through face to face contact of GGP with the community/government officials.

47.   The ERT is mindful however of the limitations of relying heavily and exclusively on building awareness and knowledge. This falls on fertile ground when there has been prior social mobilization. In the context of the GGP, its confident staff and Pro Public backed reputation make PH and other forums a safe place for claimants, even if attending as individuals. The

situation may become more difficult when the GGP staff withdraws, particularly if local facilitators have not been capacitated. It is important then for GGP to think about how their interventions can leave behind strong facilitation skills and connections to social mobilization efforts.

3.4.   Achievements under Outcome 2: "Accountable Service Providers"

48.   ***Output 2.1"Officials of Local bodies and government line agencies are skilled in responding public remarks and questions:"*** The indicators tied to this output refer to training on SA tools for officials, and the implementation of PH/PA by DDCs/VDCs. These could be useful in honing the skills of officials in responding to the public. But the output is difficult to assess over the course of one or two years. Several cycles of truly LBs/LAs conducted PH (PA are normally UC conducted) would be needed to demonstrate their skills. Only over several years would it be possible to tell if the responses were genuine, i.e., if they were followed up with consistent action. There is the danger that officials learn to absorb or deflect criticism in the PH setting, leading eventually to participant fatigue or cynicism when it becomes apparent that the event is mainly for show.

49.   At this stage of GGP Phase IV, it is possible to say that there is broad receptivity in the LBs/LAs to the application of SA tools. There is recognition of the impartial and competent facilitation undertaken by the GGP. Officials are willing to take part and to speak for their actions. Sometimes the answers are far from adequate (e.g., officials blaming other parties), but instances of meaningful responses and action are also evident. This in itself is a remarkable achievement in the Nepali context.   However, the real challenge is in following up on grievances, and that will require properly monitored action against declarations, standards of service, or other commitments. The tracking and pressing for consistent follow-up has been done in part by GGP (e.g., letter reminders), but in general there is no local mechanism established yet.

50.   ***Output 2.2"The officials in local government and line agencies are sensitised to timely communicate their plans/programmes, resources and implementation to the people:"*** The two indicators for this output do not seem to get at the essence of the output. (i.e., At least 60% service seeking people are aware of local government/line agencies' plan, programs and resources; Citizen charters are updated and compliance monitored). The second indicator requires the updating and follow up to the Citizen charters; this is not a focus of GGP activities (though the tool might be explained in GG orientations). It is also not clear why a Citizen Charter would need to be updated. This would be an infrequent activity, as the Charters are descriptions of what should be rather stable services and standards.

51.   The first indicator, relating to people's awareness of government plans, programs, and resources, could be a result of official's efforts, but they could also be the result of third party effort, as they are now in the GGP. In fact, DDC and VDC officials stressed the bridging function of the GGP, reaching out to people on their behalf. The question remains whether the officials themselves would be doing this outreach if the GGP was not there to do it for them.

52.   The GGP fulfilment of this output is also constrained by the apparent ad hoc selection of candidates for the training of government officials.   There does not appear to be strong guidance in the GGP on the individuals that should be trained, and the preparations/timing (in Ramechhap) saw lower numbers sent than expected, and not necessarily the most relevant

staff. In the case of the DEO, it appears that the staff that were specifically working on service improvement were not sent to the training.

53. **Output 2.3 "DDC receive the input from people on the implementation of LGCDP in the project district"** GGP has tracked the LGCDP, in terms of adherence to allocation guidelines and the implementation of selected projects. Generally one or two district level events have been held close around ten at VDC level in each district to provide feedback to local stakeholders, and the comments from all districts were placed in a "21 point" note sent (and presented) to the Ministry of Local Development, in early 2011.

54. There is no documentation in GGP indicating the effect of the feedback, from DDC/VDC or national level, i.e., how it has been incorporated in the LCGDP. However, the ERT learned from the LGCDP that it was grateful for the feedback.

55. The LGCDP also acknowledged to the ERT that it had used the PH manual of GGP in preparing its own PH guidelines. Again, for this take up of the GGP PH methodology, there is no assessment in GGP of the degree of take-up and of the compatibility of the methodology/approach of the GGP version with the final LGCDP version. This is unfortunate as the proper take up in the LGCDP could be seen as a significant step in "scaling-up" and "institutionalization" of the PH methodology, as desired by the GGP.

56. On a final note on this output, it will be increasingly irrelevant to discuss the LGCDP as a separate dimension from LBs/local governance; the development partner (DP) funding is now integrated with the government grant. The focus should therefore be on the key governance/service procedures and performance of LB/LAs/UGs in general.

57. **Outcome 2 "Local Government Offices and service providers are accountable to people"** Government officials have received only some light inputs from GGP, though this was to be the key shift seen in Phase IV – the balancing of demand with interventions on the supply side. The supply side interventions have been defined essentially as the flip side of some of the demand side interventions favoured by GGP. Hence government officials have been oriented to the kind of information (standards of service, budgets) required to respond to citizens, particularly in the context of the application of social accountability tools (i.e., PH, PA). They have been oriented on the application of these tools in general, and the use of declarations to develop the means for attaining accountability on promises made during the application of the tools.

> **Box 1: Examples of issues arising from PH events (conveyed to ERT)**
> - Scholarship eligibility and awards
> - Absences of teachers from schools
> - Fake certificates to obtain grants
> - Alcohol consumption
> - Lack of doctor's assistant
> - Expired drugs in health posts
> - Low frequency of APM meetings
> - Irregularities in project finances

58. All of the above have served to "alert" government officials in the VDCs/DDCs of SDC focus that they have a duty to deliver services in accordance with guidelines, and it has placed pressure on them to conform to these guidelines and show the public that they are making improvements. Many service providers, and VDC Secretaries, admitted to the ERT that now they are more aware of what are fast changing and difficult to understand guidelines, and are more vigilant in their implementation. Several respondents to the ERT noted that the GGP,

especially through the PH, had generated a culture of dialogue between key actors; VDC Secretary, the APM, service centre staff, and the public. They have dutifully noted the complaints and suggestions of participants in the PH events, and have signed or committed themselves to following through on the issues that could not be resolved at the PH. The complaints that have emerged from the PH events vary greatly (see Box 1 for examples).

59. It was more difficult to obtain evidence of service improvements that came of PH events, but as few instances of such improvements were offered to the ERT by various citizens and service providers (see Box2).

60. The satisfaction of citizens with services cannot be properly ascertained in view of the incompatibility of the relevant questions in the baseline, and the weaknesses in the CRC. As well, since the CRC has only been conducted once, whatever the results (and they are likely to be rather critical of services) it will not be possible to note thereafter any increase in satisfaction that could plausibly be linked to the GGP. This is because any subsequent CRC exercise would have to be done very soon

> **Box 2: Examples of service improvement noted by stakeholders (in ERT field work)**
> - An Assistant District Office (ADO) was established to cut the distance to service seekers on civil registry/passport matters.
> - VDC and service centres now post Citizen Charters explaining the services, and how they can be accessed.
> - Filling of vacant Health Assistant positions at the Village Health Post
> - Govt-civil society monitoring system was instituted to oversee fertilizer distribution

(before the project begins to wind down), and the time between the two CRC events will not be sufficient to note any increases in satisfaction, or explain these in terms of GGP activities in the intervening period.

61. What is also missing from the activities and outputs under this outcome is attention to the services being "self-delivered;" those where UG are given funds from the DDC/VDC to build small service infrastructure (e.g., irrigation, roads, culverts, drinking water). While GGP has adapted its activities in the GGP IV to allow support in the implementation of a few PA, this is minimal compared to the funds/projects channelled through this modality. Local stakeholders stated their views quite strongly that UCs were often infiltrated/undermined by political party interests and showed little accountability to their overall group members or to the VDC/DDC. If the contracting modality is to be given more attention, to enhance efficiency/effectiveness and accountability, then procurement processes may be a good entry point for GGP, or future Pro Public efforts. The local stakeholders even suggested that GGP build, as pilots, typical infrastructures to ascertain fair pricing and proper rate analysis of such infrastructure works. These initiatives, they said, would help mitigate the current practise of over-invoicing.

62. As a final point under this outcome, the range of interventions labeled as supply side by GGP is a very narrow slice of the entire "supply side spectrum." The GGP does not elaborate what it means by the supply side, and why it limits itself to that slice it has cut. It should do so, using as its frame of reference the 2009-2012 Strategy for Nepal, and the Good Governance Concept for Nepal. Specifically, these contain a commitment to

> effective delivery of **public services** (also and primarily responding to the needs of poor and marginalized groups and accessible to them) by an administration characterized by **credibility, competence, capacity, and integrity**

63. From that clarity, it will be easier for SDC to realistically anticipate the extent to which it can support the improvement of service delivery by working from a particular demand-supply combination.

4. GGP management and Pro Public internal governance

4.1. GGP management

64. Headquartered in Kathmandu, GGP has 14 management/technical staff in this office (GGP HQs), and in each of the districts it typically has a four person complement; coordinator, two assistant coordinators (sometimes cast as project associates/assistants) and a part-time accountant/support staff. Several activities appear to be driven and conducted largely from the HQs, including,

    a. IEC activities (radio and Nepali Bulletin)
    b. Citizen Report Card methodology, data processing/report preparation
    c. PH training
    d. Project monitoring against the LPM

65. GGP does not provide a typical overhead to Pro Public in this phase. Rather, it pays for services that are costed on a pro-rated basis (e.g., internet, generator use). Notably, there is no monitoring capacity within Pro Public that could be bought by GGP to bolster its resources, plainly inadequate to embark on a robust approach to Results Based Management.

66. In addition to inadequate staff functions that might serve GGP, Pro Public does not have any mechanism for establishing and nurturing linkages between projects, though there are some obvious content overlaps. One would expect for instance that the WB PRAN effort could provide benefits to GGP in the effort to package and disseminate social accountability tools.

67. GGP does not benefit significantly from the possible guidance and full range of checks and balances that might be expected to derive from the roles of the Executive Director and the board. At one point the GGP Project Director was sending reports directly to SDC, bypassing the Executive Director (ED). When SDC insisted on a Pro Public sign-off, GGP enlisted a board member to do so. It is telling that GGP provided an organogram to the ERT that showed a direct link from the GGP to the board, with the Executive Director nowhere to be seen.

68. The ED is at present a voluntary position, filled by a Project Director who is directly managing other Pro Public projects. This is an odd construction, as it appears to invite conflict of interest, opening the ED up to the possibility, or perception, of favouring his project(s). In this construction, there is not a proper check on the project(s) lead by the ED. Moreover, the demands of direct project direction prevent the ED role from being played with the intensity it deserves.

69. The structurally weakened ED position plays into the current antagonism between the two leading figures in the Pro Public management structure, the ED and the GPP PD. Having a weak ED position enables the GGP PD to more easily bypass it, on the grounds, real or unjustified, that the position is merely obstructive. Giving more evidence of this mindset is the apparent influence wielded by the GGP PD in excluding the ED from the GGP Project Steering Committee. Here the board, and SDC, also must reflect on their role in allowing such a construction.

70. The ED does sign off on payments and can approve expenditures between Rs. 300,000 and 500,000. But he states that he has had no involvement in planning, or reviewing monitoring and progress reports (though the board now says it has rectified this bypassing). While he has

on occasion sought to apply organizational procedures to GGP, he asserts that he has been rebuffed by the GGP PD. He further feels that on a number of crucial issues of GGP management, the Board has not backed up the position/decision of the ED.

71. The antagonism/competition between the ED and GGP PD, and the tensions it has caused within the general membership and the board, has had significant consequences on the GGP and Pro Public in the ERT's judgement. It has lead to:

a) Inefficient management of GGP due to problems of communication between ED and GGP
b) Tense work environment in Pro Public with flare ups (even a strike of GGP staff)
c) Distraction of Board and GGP PD from strategic issues of GGP (results attainment, CD strategies, ensuring sustainability)
d) Reduced transparency and vitality, as GGP is less willing to reveal and discuss challenges
e) Missed opportunities to assist GGCs with modest support to access LGAF, LGCDP, and other resources.
f) Rapid deterioration of GGCs as acknowledging actual status of clubs could become a factor in internal tussle.

72. The lost opportunities referred to above are several. The efficacy of a nationally distributed bulletin, that is now only drawing from a handful of district experiences, with little policy implications, is one instance. Another is the failing effort to network/federate the GGCs. An opportunity recently missed was that of placing Pro Public as the National Service Provider for LGAF.[1] Moreover, GGCDCCs attempting to bid for LGCDP Social Mobilization or LGAF tenders are not being given any support from GGP.

73. There are many possible, and successful, organizational models for NGOs. It appears that the strong personalities, ambitions, and antagonism within Pro Public make the chosen organizational model of Pro Public unworkable, in terms of effectively achieving GGP objectives.

74. Solving the ED-GGP PD conflict will require a fundamental reassessment of the various structures and vision of Pro Public - it is not simply a matter of appeasing one side or the other. Hence the challenge is beyond the scope of GGP to solve, though these shortcomings and challenges should have surfaced and been addressed to some extent in the GGP steering committee (SC).

4.2. Pro Public board governance

75. While the ERT was only able to meet with two of the nine executive committee members[2], these were the key figures of the President and the General Secretary, and the discussion was very open and helpful. From this discussion, the ERT learned that there is a determined effort at the board level to bring about reforms within Pro Public that will settle the mentioned antagonism and move Pro Public forward to new levels of activity and creativity.

---

[1] It appears that the inability to determine how the roles within Pro Public/GGP could be apportioned lead to the demise of what seemed on the face of it to be a strong Pro Public proposal to become the National Service Provider for LGAF.
[2] The Executive Committee essentially acts as the Board. It is elected by the general membership, numbering 58 individuals.

76.   The above conversation sensitized the ERT to the dilemma facing the board. The board is seeking to settle the antagonism between two star performers for Pro Public. Both have been successful and visible in their roles in Pro Public, and they have contributed greatly to raising the profile of Pro Public to what it is today. While acknowledging the problems being created, the board in the past split its support between the two. But since the new board was formed 18 months ago, it has made an important commitment to working towards a common stance, even if there are remaining leanings toward one or the other managers.

77.   Reform steps of the new board go beyond the managers' disputes. Over a year ago, the board was able to separate cleanly board membership from management positions. Furthermore, it has created an administrative reform committee to deal with the management tensions. The key recommendation made by the committee was that a full time ED position be created. The board subsequently approved the establishment of the position, and offered it to the existing ED, and offering the Deputy ED position to the GGP PD.

78.   The above arrangement was never implemented however, and it has taken a second committee, carefully picked to ensure "neutrality," to come forward with other options. One of these is to have the Secretary General take on the duties of the Executive Director (but this would run into the recently set separation between board and management positions it would seem). Other options offered include dissolving the ED position, or rotating it, or making it a full time position. The board is now mulling these options, but intends to move quickly on the hiring of a Development Director, who will in the meantime be a "coordinator" between all Project Directors, taking up some of the tasks of the ED. The board hopes that this rather unorthodox position (it is at the same level as the Project Directors, but has some delegated powers of the ED) will keep the peace until a longer term solution can be found.

79.   To the ERT, the slow pace of reform has a price that may not be fully appreciated by the board. The board acknowledges that over a year into its term, it remains entangled in internal tussles, rather than being outwardly oriented. More to the point for this report, it is clear that some GGP activities are not as successful as they could be as a result of the differing board/management visions and focus over the last few years.

4.3.   The decline of Good Governance Clubs

80.   With the shift away from GGCs in Phase IV, allowing only a light utilization of the clubs and a low level of training to them, the clubs have withered rapidly. This turn of events is surprising in view of the commitment in the project document, stemming from the 2008 Self-Assessment of GGP, that in Phase IV the "**GG club network in the Project will be properly managed.**"

81.   In the three districts visited (Dailekh, Dholakha, Ramechhap), the roughly 450 registered clubs (as of 2009) have shrunk to about 90 active clubs. No new clubs have registered since Phase IV began. Even in some focus VDCs visited in the ER, the team noted that GGCs were non-existent from the perspective of the community. Perhaps only a dozen of the umbrella GGCDCC bodies are still functioning nationwide, according to a GGCDCC chair informant in Nepalgunj. That would be an astonishing decline from the 64 registered at end of Phase III. The situation in SDC focus districts is thus worrisome, and in non-SDC focus districts it is likely to be dire. In the very rough estimate of the ERT, Pro Public is probably "mentoring" fewer than 500 truly vibrant clubs nationwide, compared to the over 6,000 figure that is still being presented by Pro Public/GGP.

82. The ERT has noted a sense at the grassroots that Pro Public is not appreciative of the GGCs. The much reduced support to GGCs in Phase IV, and the lack of a voice of GGCDCCs and GGCs in the governance of Pro Public are key grievances. As one GGCDCC member voiced it "we feel abandoned." Some GGP staff believe it would be wise for the Pro Public board to be more inclusive, widening as a first step, its current general membership to include GGCDCCs/GGCs. Apparently the Pro Public constitution allows for this ascension. However, seen from the viewpoint of some Pro Public stakeholders, there may well be some concerns about the modality and wisdom of allowing GGCs within the Pro Public inner sanctum, in view of the range of capabilities and conduct of GGCs, and the current rift within the management (and to some extent the board).

83. The tussle over Pro Public's expansion of general membership or board control appears to the ERT to be a power game from which GGCs stand to gain little. Rather, they appear as mere pawns in an internal struggle. They are either used as leverage for one side seeking to gain a bigger role within Pro Public, or kept at a distance and too hastily pushed to federate by another to place them farther from Pro Public. Neither treatment is worthy of the contribution they have made and the potential they have if properly affiliated with Pro Public and mentored by it.

5. Relevance and soundness of GGP approach

5.1. Adding supply side support to the GGP

84.   As GGP documents rightly point out, the lessons of local governance support over the last two decades points to the need to address both demand and supply side support. This stance however meant that the GGP/Pro Public was taken beyond what it was used to doing (demand side support), primarily at the urging of SDC.

85.   Naturally, GGP has extended itself to the supply side on those aspects that it feels most comfortable; i.e. the immediate flip side of demands side support relating primarily to provisioning of information. It went this extra distance only on the condition that the there would be an "additive" budget; maintaining its core activities was the quid pro quo for also following SDC's direction – one that was explicitly laid out in the 2009-2012 SDC Strategy for Nepal.

86.   In practice, the emphasis of GGP Phase IV has continued to be the application of the social accountability tools, namely the Public Hearing (PH), Public Audit (PA) and Citizen Report Card (CRC). Through the orientations to both civil society and government bodies in the locality, they have also encouraged (and given some minimal advice) on such practices as placing a Hoarding Board, developing a Citizen Charter, or operating a Help Desk in the District/Village Development Committee (DDC) offices.   FM radio announcements, designed in GGP headquarters (HQs), also complement this effort. There is also some monitoring of the budgets and their implementation, to note compliance with national guidelines.

87.   The supply side of GGP is less visible, and relates to preparing the government side to engage properly in the events applying the social accountability tools of the GGP.   The government side is also given training on national expectations regarding the services they are to deliver (with a focus on service standards). The other supply side effort, which blends into demand side support, is the sharing of information to the public regarding services to which they have a right. This information is conveyed to the public through FM radio, pamphlets, and village based orientations. While the messages are available to the government officials, they are primarily addressed to citizens (demand side).

88.   Compared to the demand side activity, the direct and exclusively supply side activity (e.g. service standards orientation) is not intensive – only a minor part of the GGP budget is devoted to it. It is more of a supplement to help orient the government side to what the demand side tools are meant to achieve, and some preparation for responding to the demands raised. The GGP does not deal in any significant way with a wide range of other supply side interventions that could make the services more effective; local government and service centre revenue transfers and revenue mobilization, recruitment, technical training, organizational set-up, team management, incentives for performance, planning and monitoring procedures, procurement, audits, vertical technical back up and supervision from the national government, clarity of functional assignment to LBs/LAs and consistent devolution. Many of the latter are presently being addressed, in some form, by the LGCDP.

89.   The ERT points out the limited nature of the GGP supply side effort to note that on the one hand it is closely tied to the demand side activities (this is desirable), but also that it does not go

very deeply into supply side interventions that are needed to ensure effective service delivery. While GGP has responded to the call to "do more than just claim," it has set limits to its involvement in the supply side that will also limit the scope for service delivery improvement that can be expected.

90. The narrow scope of supply side activity, while relevant, must then be seen in the context of other government and non-government efforts to improve the supply side. GGP can only make a modest contribution to service improvement on its own. This means that it needs to be careful in making claims of service improvement success, always looking to see how other actors are contributing to this success as well. Conversely, if its success on the supply side is modest, this flows from its narrow scope of intervention. Expectations must be realistic.

91. SDC will need to consider whether the GGP scope of supply side support is what it is seeking, with reference to its desire to support "local state building" and specifically its commitment to achieve its strategic outcome 2.2 "Local governments deliver effectively development services in respond to demands and aspirations of citizens, especially DAGs, in Swiss cluster districts." GGP alone will not be sufficient to make significant strides toward these larger aims.

5.2. The robustness of the PH tools

92. The GGP has focused its efforts in the implementation of PH, at focus district level and in some of the focus VDCs. The PH is a broad scope interaction between citizens and officials/service providers. In the second year of GGP, PA were also added, though a limited number and on a requested basis. The PA is a project level tool, suitable to hold the User Committee accountable to its larger membership, particularly on the use of funds. The Citizen Report Card is also applied in the six districts. This is a tool for more systematically assessing service quality/reach. However, in the GGP, this was a rather limited effort, particularly for the districts. The GGP HQs does the analysis and preparation of the report. Its staff also descends to the districts to facilitate the presentation of the findings. The CRC has been conducted in 4 districts, and the final forum for the presentation of results is planned soon for the two remaining districts (Dailekh and Jajarkot).

93. There has been some concern raised by government officials, and SDC, regarding the appropriateness of the PH methodology, the flagship tool that has contributed to the high profile of Pro Public, and GGP. The ERT discussion with District Coordinators reveals that the methodology has been changing over time, responding to feedback on the tool's application. The main concern raised is that the methodology is unnecessarily negative. This comment can be seen in the 2005 report of the External Review for GGP Phase II. It continues to surface, and it has been received by the ERT in discussions with some officials (e.g., LDO, DEO). This criticism of the tool is generally accompanied by what seems to be a sensible solution, offered by the 2005 External Reviewer, and apparently put in practice to some degree by GGP; to bring to light the good aspects of service delivery "to balance" the event.

94. The ERT compiled a number of important issues in the course of its field work on the methodology of the PH, and to a lesser extent of the CRC. While on the whole there is widespread support for the application of the PH in particular, there are also a number of concerns or options that need to be considered in its application. The ERT noted that the GGP has a 2010 manual on the PH, one that also was used by the Ministry of Local Development

(MLD) to draw up a broad framework for the PH it is promoting for government use. However, it does not appear that more recent discussions of methodology that do occur within GGP, particularly at local level – and sometimes joined by HQs staff, are incorporated in the GGP manual. Moreover, there has not been a systematic comparison of the more detailed GGP manual with the broad guidelines for the PH created by the MLD.

95. The ERT believes that if the GGP goal of institutionalizing the PH has any chance of success, the model(s) of the PH that will be carried out "by government" needs to be carefully examined to ensure that it gives room to apply practices and lessons that have arisen over the last decade through the work of Pro Public/GGP. The ERT was struck by the range of views of district officials regarding the nature of the PH that could be said to comply with the Good Governance Act of 2006.

96. This incoherence in what could be an "institutionalized PH" should give rise to concern to Pro Public/GGP. It could endanger an important aim of the GGP. In the longer term, it could also cut out external facilitation from Pro Public, GGCs, and other non-government actors as facilitators. Ultimately, it may lead to ritualistic events that invite participant fatigue and cynicism. It is critical then that the methodological issues shown in Box 3 be addressed, ideally within the life of GGP.

> **Box 3: PH Methodology Issues**
> - How much positive news and how to incorporate it in the event
> - To be held annually or more frequently
> - To be aimed at all government units or service clusters
> - To be held only in the district capital or in sub-regions (Ilakas)
> - Accepting government will organize/fund, whether it should also facilitate or use external facilitators
> - Extent, if any, of preceding activities that burden the process and make it less spontaneous, and more charged; research/sounding of government units
> - What kind of mechanisms are needed to ensure declarations are properly followed up, and monitored
> - Should external facilitation stress local facilitators or those with greater expertise but from outside the area
> - Situating the PH tool in the mix of SA and participatory mechanisms.

97. The methodology issues listed in the Box are not trivial. The deceptively simple solution that it is best to avoid an adversarial relationship in the PH, by balancing negatives with positives, is not easy to implement, while retaining the core of the PH event. GGP has tried to react to a particularly serious charge levelled against it by a Chief District Officer (CDO) in Okhaldhunga district. He believed that the PH's attempt to "blame and shame" is ultimately counterproductive. He also maintained that the PH was based on invalid data, collected by outsiders. The GGP response to this and other criticism has been ad hoc, and it is by no means clear that it appropriate or that it has permeated the approaches used in all of the GGP districts.

98. The ERT could not go deeply into the Okhaldhunga case, but it does reveal that the wide acceptance of the tool and the good reception given to Pro Public/GGP in government circles, seen also by the ERT, cannot be taken for granted. It is crucial that the methodology be refined and adapted to specific settings and configuration of actors, through the involvement of the community of practice. There is no mechanism within the GGP to achieve this aim, though the arrival of a World Bank supported project (PRAN) in Pro public, with one aim to share lessons and package the tools more effectively, offers GGP an opportunity.

5.3. The robustness of the CRC tool

99. The ERT cannot comment as deeply on the appropriateness of the CRC, as this is a relatively new tool for Pro Public/GGP. Where the ERT did probe (in Dailekh/Jajarkot), the final phase of the tool application had not been concluded yet.

100. District coordinators have indicated that the CRC has its strengths, and drawbacks. They note that it more systematic and deeper than the PH, but it lacks the immediacy of placing the service claimers in direct contact with providers to have a relatively unscripted interaction.

101. The ERT is aware that the CRC is not a standardized method that must follow a particular methodology. But the methodology chosen by GGP does raise some flags. The survey was conducted with the use of a questionnaire - filled in by users exiting government offices/service centres. But at least in the case of the District Education Officer (DEO) the questionnaire ended up being answered by rather atypical "service users"; teachers inquiring about their pay for instance. The DEO of Dailekh stressed that the he is not providing services, yet his office is included in the scrutiny, though he only deals with "services" to teachers and other actors in the delivery system. The schools deal with students and parents. This is a point that GGP needs to take seriously, in sorting out what the CRC results may be saying, and in answering the data needs for the indicator in the LMP that refers to the satisfaction of "Public service recipients... with service provided." The right organizations and services need to be assessed.

102. In addition to identifying the right service users, the CRC questions must be well designed. An agricultural office (DADO) official felt frustrated on learning that his office was poorly regarded on a question regarding "home visits by the extension service." He stressed to the GGP that the government extension services, as a matter of strategy, does not make households the level of organization/support; farmer groups are gathered at a community venue (therefore, the question was irrelevant in the first place). Other questions were also objected to by other offices. That the CRC tool contains questions that do not reflect the service process points to a weak grasp of the technical side of service supply of GGP. It is notable that GGP has no service specialist on staff; but it has two radio communication specialists.

103. The ERT learned from the Deputy Director of GGP that a second CRC is planned for all districts, with a stronger set of questions, vetted by stakeholders. Though the time remaining seems much too short, the Deputy felt duty bound to implement the CRC. This would mean that a second CRC would be done just a few months after the last one. In the view of the ERT, this tool is best applied at intervals of a year of multiple years. The GGP could instead hold a proper assessment of the CRC application, gleaning all of the lessons it provided, and reflecting this in the CRC manual and information packages that can be useful to the community of practice. At most, one application, in a test district, could be done to test the refinements.

5.4. Selecting the mix of tools

104. In prior phases, the range of tools used was broader, including a greater emphasis on Public Audits. The GGP in other phases also supported a Citizen Complaints Platform (CCP) and Help Desks. It is not clear why there has been a narrowing of tools in Phases IV. The project document seems to call for the continuation, and institutionalization, of the same set used previously; PH, PA, CCP, CRC and Help Desk. It seems that this intention was scaled back in the YOP, likely based on limited resources in the project.

105. GGP Coordinators felt that the CRC was not yet mature, methodologically, but that it could be a useful complement to the PH tool; it should not be a matter of choosing one over the other. They also felt that more attention needs to be paid to PA, as VDCs give most of their funds to user groups (UG) who then entrust the funds to their User Committee (UC). The Public Audit is therefore crucial in ensuring accountability of the funds to the larger UG, and to the VDC.

106. All three tools used in GGP (PH, PA, CRC) need to be situated against the range of social accountability and participation tools that are mandated or possible. It would not be proper, or fair to the method, to expect that the PH will solve all of the problems of service delivery. Efforts will need to be made to involve citizens as individuals or groups in a number of other ways; in the planning process, procurement watch, joint monitoring, joint management of service centres. There could also be linkages between the PH and these other forms. For instance, the CDO of Dailekh opined that the PH forum could be used to comment on the suitability and use of these additional mechanisms, with the view to note how they can be reinforced where found wanting.

107. The ERT believes that it is important for Pro Public/GGP to widen their view on the range of SA and participatory tools available, and to be ready to use the best tool for the job. There is the danger of seeing every challenge as a "nail" simply because we only know how to wield a "hammer." The PH should be seen for what it is, one (usually annual) event. It should not be practiced to the neglect of other interactive and ongoing mechanisms in policy making, planning, procurement, implementation, auditing and monitoring. Forging a close link to PRAN, which is examining a wider set of demand side tools, may be helpful in this endeavour.

5.5.   GGP support for both demand and supply: is it possible or wise?

108. Answering this question, one posed by the SDC to the ERT, is not a straightforward task. Much depends on what kind of demand and what kind of supply activities an organization supports. There are cases in other countries where a development partner supported project has done both, successfully. For instance, the Democratic Reforms Support project of USAID in Indonesia has worked with government officials on regulatory changes, while fostering CSO awareness of the issues, their own independent research efforts, and opportunities to bring these views to the government table. In this same country however, a GIZ sponsored project sought to support city administrations while also supporting civil society mobilization around service issues. The city administration saw GTZ as not being loyal to it and stopped its cooperation.

109. The answer also depends on the nature and reputation of the organization that is trying to do both, and it also depends on the skill with which they are executed. Pro Public has a good reputation, of professionalism, impartiality and a distance from the party politics (although there are cited instances where this distance was not evident). The ERT was struck by the easy access GGP has to top levels in the district (CDO and LDO) and the warm and encouraging stance of officials towards Pro Public/GGP (for some Pro Public is the entity they "see", while others relate more to GGP).

110. There are some reasons why it may be difficult for Pro Public to work simultaneously on both the demand and supply side:

a. Skill sets required are rather different
b. LBs may object to the dual role
c. Conflicts of interest may arise

111. Working with LBs on the supply side means working with partners that are constrained in several ways. They are accountable largely vertically to national institutions (especially since the APM members are not elected). They have rigid procedures they must follow, and their class/caste composition removes them somewhat from the realities of the most disadvantaged. Working constructively with partners trapped in dysfunctional organizations requires great stamina, understanding of the challenges facing government officials, creativity in finding promising entry points, and persistence. Moreover, Pro Public/GGP would need to have a greater technical understanding of service delivery than it has exhibited in GGP Phase IV. It is telling that GGP does not have a single "service delivery"/Local Government specialist, whereas it has a strong media unit.

112. The CRC experience in Okhaldhunga shows that LBs/LAs sometimes take badly to pointed criticism. It is quite probable that LB officials in this situation may decline to work with GGP, or will not have the trust in it that is required to work well with GGP. From the GGP side, there may be perceptions, or apprehension, that working with the LB/LA officials may cause its work with civil society to suffer as harsh criticism from civil society may signal also that GGP has not had much success on the supply side. It is crucial that Pro Public/GGP return to these questions periodically as their work progresses. There is no easy answer; principles and values need to be applied in a given context. The point is to be thoughtful and to avoid high risk situations where the payoff is not commensurate with the risk.

5.6.   GGP's link to other SDC projects

113. The ERT was not able to pursue this inquiry to a satisfactory degree, but comments obtained from District Coordinators suggest that the GGP was reactive, responding to the SDC's own annual efforts to convene projects to find synergy among them. This was an ad hoc effort at best. Some coordination of PH and PA events did take place, but the interaction was probably less than was merited by the common objectives between projects.

114. In one respect the link between GGP and other projects was too tight. As explained in the phasing-out of Dolakha (see Section 7), the GGP was phased out of that district simply because SDC was closing down its entire portfolio in the district.

6. Use of funds

6.1.   Financial reporting

115. The ERT did not spend much time on the financial reporting of GGP, in part because it did not receive requested reports until very late in the review. Its cursory review of the budget and expenditure summary provided gives the impression, when compared with field work observations, that GGP does a considerable amount of work on a rather modest budget.

116. The modest budget does have some consequences. District Coordinators are paid very low salaries to keep the project costs low. It is difficult to attract strong candidates with low salaries. Even so, and though the Coordinators exhibit more dedication than technical skills, at this cost they provide good value for the money.

117. The summary report for the two years provided to the ERT is shown in Appendix 8. This single summary report did not contain any variance analysis, though it is clear that the project must do so and justify (and obtain approval) for variances beyond 10%. The variances in Appendix 8 have been calculated by the ERT. Some exceed the 10% by a long stretch. Yet there is no report (or planning document) that acknowledged these variances and places them in the context of shifting priorities or strategies. The Steering Committee also does not show any such requests/approvals for variances.

118. The financial reports (as well as other reports) had at one point been coming directly from the project, until SDC insisted that they come from "Pro Public." This resulted in reports that are signed by the President of the board of Pro Public, rather than the Executive Director, as might be expected.

119. The ERT also requested to receive the GGP financial audit but this was not received.

7. Sustainability,

7.1. What is to be sustainable?

120. There are several initiatives or results of GGP that deserve to live past the closing of the project:

- Implementation of PH by the LBs, Line Agencies and VDCs (if this is deemed appropriate)
- External facilitation of government organized PH
- Provision of information to the public on services and their rights
- Citizens and CBOs monitor and put pressure on government to fulfil commitments

121. The GGP refers to the need to institutionalize SA tools, principally the PH. It wants this tool to be institutionalized within government units, to allow them to carry out the directives of the Good Governance Act 2006. Whether the government (DDC, VDCs, LAs) in the project areas wish to, or can, implement the PH is difficult to say at this point. Some officials replied to the ERT that if the law says to do it, then it must be done. But they said or hinted that it will done in a perfunctory/formulaic fashion. There was also confusion about what a "government" executed PH might mean, particularly whether it would still allow for external facilitation. GGP should be clarifying a methodology in partnership with cooperating districts that is in tune with the Good Governance Act while still allowing for the good practices it has generated to date.

122. Returning to a previous observation that DDC and VDC officials perceive the GGP as their bridge to the people, it is fair to ask if the officials themselves would be prepared to take on such outreach activities at the end of the project. Will they continue to inform the public of their rights, of available resources, of projects allotted, and of the success or failure of their efforts? Or will they only do so if GGP or other third party acts as the bridge to citizens?

123. The answer to the likely conduct of the PH by government and the continued openness to information and adherence to guidelines must depend in part on how GGP is preparing officials for the post-project scenario. At the moment, it does not appear that GGP has an exit strategy that would ensure the maintenance of some practices. This phenomenon is all too common in development cooperation; innovative practices are sustained until such time as the support/pressure/scrutiny is removed. The GIZ-PASRA informant cautioned the ERT that this was the pattern seen in GIZ and other DP sponsored projects, alluding to the PA tool; these were practiced only where projects were located and while projects were operating.

124. The ERT would like to believe that the enhanced voice, especially of DAG, will persist after the GGP closes. But this presupposes an irreversible mind set change among government officials. Realistically, if the pressure eases on them, there is a chance they will revert to their past practices. The question then turns to the cohesiveness and capacity of the citizen groups that have been empowered by the "information" approach of the GGP. Where social capital is strong, there may well be a persistent voice of the disadvantaged. Where it remains weak (the information was fed to atomized and disempowered individuals), the assertiveness may evaporate once the well regarded external intermediary is removed.

125. Related to the last point, if local organizations (such as the GGCs) are empowered to play the role now played by the GGP, it is possible that the assertiveness of the DAG/citizens will persist, and even be strengthened if the individuals can be brought together as collective entities of various affiliation (e.g., women, farmers, DAG). To date, the GGP has not sought to replace itself in this manner however.

7.2.   The GGCs in Phase IV: support and sustainability

126. In Phase IV, the GGCs practically disappeared from the GGP. It is not clear what lead to this design, though it may be that the shift to the supply side stretched the GGP and lead to downsizing past commitments. Although they have been included in some generic Good Governance training, and sometimes receive some informal advice from District Coordinators, they are no longer a key target group.

127. The GGC "network" is made use of when GGP needs to communicate events, and the GGCs do this work on a voluntary basis. When GGP staff organize PH events, in the VDCs in particular, they request GGC members' assistance, and provide a token financial incentive in return. The GGCDCC also is not a target group for the GGP, with the relationship between GGP District Coordinators and GGCDCC being merely coordinative. Some GGCDCC involvement in the GGP YOP was mentioned, but this input appears to be limited. Overall, the GGP-clubs relationship is very low. The only strong link remaining is that many GGP staff originate from GGCs/GGCDCCs, and are thus favourably disposed towards the clubs. This results in some favourable treatment; the GGCDCC in Ramechhap and Dailekh are able to use the GGP offices as their headquarters for instance.

128. According to the GGP District Coordinators, this neglect of the GGCs is unfortunate, as the GGCs, though not very active at the moment, could do much more if supported. The GGCDCC is more categorical, stating that "they have been abandoned" by the GGP and Pro Public. The decision to stop the Phase III Local Action Fund (LAF) is particularly regretted. This was seen, by the District Coordinators in Dailekh, to arise from some misuse of funds and a lack of proper monitoring from GGP. The ERT also heard from the Executive Director of Pro Public that GGP had been allowing individuals to receive the funds, rather than insisting on the clubs being registered/having a bank account. The Pro Public board eventually wished to take up this safeguard, but SDC eventually just dropped the fund in Phase IV. It is puzzling that this issue could not be worked out, but instead had to result in what seems like a sub-optimal solution, at least for the GGCs.

129. There is evidence that the GGCs, when supported, can do good work. In Surkhet, GGCs have received modest funding from an NGO for peace efforts, and the district coordinators believe the funds were well used and the activities successful. In Surkhet and Dolakha, the GGCDCC is pursuing LGAF funding. The Dolakha GGCDCC has been successful in obtaining a contract from the LGCDP to be the "Local Service Provider" for SM in three VDCs. The Nepalgunj GGC has transformed itself into an NGO that is apparently busy and vibrant.

130. Overall however, the clubs are in rapid decline. The resource thin GGCs (in the Swiss focus districts) have reacted in several ways to the withdrawn support:

   a. Most are becoming dormant; only about 90 of 450 clubs in the three visited districts are active in any meaningful way (in Dailekh, Ramechhap, Dolakha).

b. Some are continuing to volunteer their services to stakeholders and GGP, and in the GGP districts are occasionally benefiting from low intensity technical support from GGP

c. Some are seeking other funders and stretching their scope of services.

131. Those GGCs that remain viable appear in fact to have slowly expanded their scope of interest from anti-corruption to broader issues of governance. It appears that a "Darwinian" process is at work; after an enthusiastic growth/transformation of radio listening groups a decade ago, the difficult process of affecting change in an increasingly complex governance context (no local elections etc.) may be placing a strain on the rather narrowly focused "anti-corruption" campaigners.

132. Moving beyond the "anti-corruption" campaigns, and the rather facile stunts employed in the early years (e.g., raiding offices to detect absences; requesting records of past absences) has not been easy for the clubs. It is difficult to maintain continuity as young people enter and soon move on, when their schooling is done or they become employed. There is an institutional threshold that must be overcome to attract resources from donors; donors often require registration, and three year record of successful activity. They must acquire new skills and project competence. This is also true if they wish to attract funds directly from government.

133. Some have no doubt acquired skills in public hearings and other tools, through their association with Pro Public. Even so, these skills may not always be marketable, particularly if the Pro Public backing recedes from view. There is little to reassure government offices that the clubs are still connected to Pro Public and nurtured to be adequate partners to them. It is understandable if VDCs in particular are reluctant to allocate relatively scarce funds for "facilitative" work that places the Local Body under scrutiny, especially if the facilitative skills are suspect.

134. At this point, and with a continuation of the current scenario, it may well be that only a few hundred GGCs will prove to be truly vibrant survivors. Whether the recent and future decline of some clubs is a healthy shake out, or the loss of a potential resource, is difficult to tell. The ERT suspects that there may well be clubs that would have grown to be self-sustaining and productive, with a little more support. At the same time, some natural culling is probably not a bad thing. For instance, having more than one club in a VDC/DDC/Municipality is probably not a good idea; consolidation into one club would be advisable.

135. One initiative that is a natural strategy for sustainability is conspicuous for its absence; support for the federation of GGCs. The idea of a federation was born in 2008 after a good number of GGCDCCs convened in Kathmandu to address the threatened LAF. Unsuccessful in this attempt, the GGCDCCs gravitated to the idea of forming a federation to further their common interests. The GGP counselled against a rapid effort, to allow for all GGCDCCs to gather and be involved in the decision. But about 13 GGCDCCs decided to establish the federation immediately, encouraged by some members of the Pro Public board. This lead to a deep rift within Pro Public-GGP, and a stalled effort to federate. It is unfortunate that this rift could not be overcome in time to give Phase IV the role of mid-wife to the federation, which is evidently supported by the clubs (though there are different views on its structure), and in principle at least by the GGP.

136. It would seem that any future support from SDC, or other donors, should be to support what is evidently a difficult transition for the clubs, from creatures of GGP/Pro-Public, to a federated, self-directing and sustainable organization with strong linkages to Pro Public and a scope of action that is relevant to local and national governance challenges.

7.3. Evidence from the phasing out of Dolakha district

137. It is important for Pro Public and SDC to learn from the districts where GGP has phased out its activities. An assessment of what has happened since will determine if claims continue to be made, and to ascertain whether this is due to the persistence of GGP effects, or other efforts to generate voice and mobilize. It would be useful to all national stakeholders to have such an understanding.

138. The ERT's limited assessment of the recent Dolakha phase-out raises some important questions. The district officials (CDO and LDO, and Focal Point for GGP) were unanimous in stating that the GGP work was vital, but that it was withdrawing too soon. The CDO stated that it would need 5 more years of GGP support before the district could be a model district for others to follow. This may sound discouraging to Pro Public and SDC, but it is actually in line with institutional development experiences elsewhere.

139. It appears that the SDC decision to phase out of Dolakha, was influenced by the SDC's overall phase-out policies for its portfolio in certain districts, rather than the maturity of its work in the GGP or the stated needs of local stakeholders.   In this regard, it is worth returning to the project document. It indicates in the Project Exit Strategy (Section 9) that "During this phase the local bodies like DDC and VDCs are expected to be conducting the Public Hearings and Public Audits on their own." The reality is that GGP staff are doing much of the organizing and the facilitation; the events are not truly owned by the local bodies (and certainly not by the line agencies). Recently it seems that some division of labour between GGP and government is being generated. For instance, the DDC will invite the line agencies to attend the PH.

140. The same can be said of the GGCs and other CBOs/NGOs in the locality. The support has not yet extended to building their capacities to replace GGP. The GGCs would be one obvious group to develop into this role.

8. Enhancing internal governance of Pro Public

141. As already mentioned, the new board has taken some positive steps to improve overall internal governance of Pro Public. It has not yet addressed the fundamental adversarial relationship between its two PDs, which is disturbing the entire organization and has negative effects on GGP. But it hopes that its patchwork solution (the Development Director position) will buy it time to achieve a more comprehensive restructuring at a later point. This hope may pan out, or the chain of command could become even more distorted and dysfunctional.

142. There will come a time when the board will need to restructure, by implementing its original plan ideally (proposed by a committee established by the board) to institute a full time Executive Director position, and recruiting to it a capable individual that can garner the respect of all division heads and project directors. That individual will need to be consistently supported by the board, avoiding special deals/considerations that would once again start the organization down a slippery slope.

143. Only Pro Public will know when it is the right time to make the move, but it must be aware that its partners may lack confidence in Pro Public until such a transition has been made. Pro Public probably finds that transition difficult, having come from a beginning where it was more of a forum than a typical organization. In recent years the organization has grown into what can be described as a loose association of professional, each with his own reputation and ability to develop and manage projects.

144. It appears that the board now wishes to continue the evolution, to an organization that is more cohesive and develops opportunities based on a shared vision. This would be a natural development, and one that is not incompatible with giving considerable room for managerial initiative, direction, and visibility. What should be different, is an insistence on better alignment of individual interests with the organization's interests.   The ERT believes that any manager/project director that does not share this organizational evolution should make that clear.

145. In keeping with the above points, the ERT suggests that SDC set some conditionalities (arising from Pro Public's own reform agenda) for continuing support to GGP, with the aim to ensure GGP success. Moreover, it suggests that SDC offer the Pro Public board some support to ease the organizational transition over the next year or two. Being well embarked on this transition should be an internal governance benchmark for Pro Public that SDC, or any other partner, would do well to consider before making further substantial commitments.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1.   Much has been accomplished by GGP

146. Much has been accomplished by GGP over the decade it has operated, in its various phases. It is rather difficult to disentangle from these achievements the attainments specifically made in the first two years of Phase IV. This is in part due to the difficulties GGP has faced in shifting to a Results Based LPM model. However, the ERT's qualitative assessment suggests that GGP is well accepted and deemed essential in the reform efforts of district and village level actors. The flagship instrument, the Public Hearing, is particularly appreciated, and applied with considerable skill by GGP.

9.2.   The legacy of GGP needs to be ensured

147. There are some very worthwhile endeavours in GGP IV that have not had the time to come to fruition as planned. There are also efforts that are not strictly part of Phase IV plans, but which deserve to be addressed before Pro Public and SDC can feel that they have made the required contribution and addressed sustainability. These might be viewed as activities designed to ensure a meaningful legacy for the project. The essential remaining work for GGP is as follows:

   a. Public Hearing and Citizen Report Card methodologies need to be purposefully tested, refined and packaged for dissemination
   b. The PH methodology needs to be explored for its potential for institutionalization (in government)
   c. The status, capabilities, and intentions of the good governance clubs/DCCs need to be ascertained as it appears they have seriously deteriorated.

148. If resources permit, GGP/ Pro Public should also give consideration to the following activities:

   d. Certifying selected good governance clubs or GGCDCCs as competent facilitators for Public Hearings
   e. Strengthening the club's access to other sources of resources.
   f. Reviewing the Good Governance Bulletin (and local versions) to find its future focus and sustainability.

149. Provided Pro Public is receptive, SDC (alone or in tandem with World Bank/PRAN) should consider extending support to Pro Public that would ease its internal governance reform efforts. This could be an organizational development exercise specifically oriented to the reform challenges of Pro Public, or a broader visioning and strategic planning process. It is essential that the outcome of this exercise restore the credibility of Pro Public as a source of good governance.

150. To achieve the above, it is recommended that some steps already be taken over the remaining 11 months of the 2009-2012 Phase IV. Moreover, the ERT recommends that a funded one year extension be given to GGP to achieve the above.

9.3. Short term steps in Phase IV: Modification of the YOP 3

151. With less than a year left, it will be a challenge to refocus the GGP. Certain planned commitments undoubtedly should be fulfilled. But a good start to the above tasks can also be made, by adjusting the last Yearly Operational Plan. These modifications should not be costly, but if they do imply financial reallocations, these should come from cutting or trimming activities of low relevance or priority (e.g., constitutional consultations, "strikes" advocacy, radio spots, CRCs, some PH/PA, consultancies not yet committed, data collection on problematic indicators, staff upgrading). These resources should be applied to:

   i. Focus the PH and CRC efforts to attain robust knowledge products.
   ii. Hold an internal GGP/Pro Public workshop to review the PH documentation to determine the state of the art, and indicate what needs to be packaged or further tested for use by:
       a. Good Governance Clubs
       b. Government units
       c. NGOs and Consultants
   iii. Identify the status of the GGCs nationwide, by conducting a survey through GGCDCCs that will identify the level and type of activity, composition, potential and capacity development needs of the clubs (including desire to federate and form of federation).

152. Again, if resources permit, it would behoove GGP/Pro Public to also take on the following efforts in the last year of GGP:

   iv. Develop a robust training of trainers course in PH; to be delivered by GGP early in the extension phase to GGCDCCs or its designated trainers. A certification system should accompany this effort, for the trainers, and for the participants who become facilitators.
   v. Provide institutional strengthening/proposal training to selective GGCDCCs that will place them in a competitive position for future cycles of the LGAF and other opportunities.
   vi. Develop a terms of reference for the review of the Good Governance Bulletin (national and local versions managed by the GGCDCCs), to assess its publishing umbrella, readership, content, finances and prospects for future focus and sustainability.

153. If the offer of support from SDC has been accepted, Pro Public could define the organizational support it needs, and SDC/PRAN could assist Pro Public to procure a senior management consultant/firm to facilitate an organizational development exercise to address key challenges faced by the organization. Ideally, this activity would be conducted in the last year of Phase IV.

9.4. General activities for the one year extension

154. The activities for the extension year are linked to the modifications already begun in the last year of Phase IV. To simplify its work, and track only what is feasible and important, GGP should slim down its LPM and monitoring efforts to reflect the new focus. This new focus would include the following activities:

155. ***Activity I: Refinement, training and dissemination of Public Hearing and Citizen Report Card methodologies.*** The methodologies will be applied in Swiss cluster districts, with a clear agenda for what has to be further tested/refined. These will be accompanied by a rigorous reflection and documentation approach. PH and CRC manuals for TOT and application

will be produced for the relevant target groups/facilitation approaches (e.g., government, NGOs, GGCs). This activity should create a linkage between GGP and the Pro Public PRAN, which has the aim of enhancing SA tools.

156. ***Activity II: Review impact of demand side activism on the improvement of services***. This reflection should be national in scale, involve government and other supporters and stakeholders. It should seek to share experiences in successes and challenges in affecting service reach, quality, and effectiveness through demand side support. The event should indicate what is known to work, what needs to be further proven (and how), and how far CSOs involved in demand side efforts can successfully deepen their reach on the "supply side" to support government to deliver services effectively. Ideally, this effort should be linked with the Danida study planned in 2011 on the theme of support for civil society in Nepal.

157. Resources permitting, the following activities could be also continued or initiated in the extension year:

158. ***Activity III: Accreditation of GGCs in Public Hearing facilitation***. GGP will deliver TOT to selected members of the GGCDCC or GGCDCC designated trainers. Those that successfully complete the training will be certified trainers for Pro-Public's PH approach, and they will be able to train GGCs and award them Pro Public's certification for facilitating PH events.

159. ***Activity IV: Review the focus and viability of the Good Governance Bulletin(s)***. Implement the ToRs for the review of the GG Bulletin(s), prepared in the third year of Phase IV. Determine current distribution, readership, financial sustainability, focus, relevance and future prospects, linking with the key stakeholders in this process. Recommendations for the focus and viability of the bulletins should be made, particularly for the national version.

160. ***Activity V: Advisory support to GGC/GGCDCC federation at national level***. If the clubs have indicated they wish to federate, GGP could support them in an advisory/mentoring capacity. It would be best for the clubs to seek direct SDC or other support for the overall federation effort.

161. If the Pro Public organizational development exercise is not completed, or requires a further stage, this could also be conducted in this extension year.

9.5. Longer term approach of SDC to supporting good governance

162. The ERT was also asked to comment on other good governance programmatic opportunities and partners. This was difficult to accomplish in the short time given. The ERT was able to ascertain that in the view of other DPs and national government officials, there is much work to be done and no danger of SDC being crowded out. It is quite possible for SDC to continue to make a contribution outside of the LGCDP/LGAF, though there should be an attempt to be complementary to these key initiatives.

163. It is possible however to use the remaining time in GGP to explore new initiatives, through the knowledge development and sharing activities in the project. Some avenues that the ERT can see at this time are listed below:

164. **Continuation of the Pro Public partnership:** With the suggested approach to the final year of Phase IV and the extension year, SDC and Pro Public may find themselves in 2013 in a good position to continue their partnership in familiar or new initiatives.

165. **Engagement with GGCs to establish a national federation**: Direct support to the GGCs/GGCDCC to federate could be a new opportunity for SDC, allowing SDC to safeguard the investment made over the last decade. The engagement of SDC would possible entail three years of support, to allow for setting up structures, support the visioning and strategic planning of the federation, and supporting selected initial activities of the new body as it seeks to revitalize the GGCs.

166. Pro Public could be a partner in this effort, becoming a mid-wife to the birth of this organization. However, it should not be managing the effort, but simply advise/mentor. This will allow Pro Public to focus on its internal governance issues without the added complexity of managing this process. Once the federation is established, it can forge bonds with Pro Public that will be to mutual advantage.

167. **Exploring new themes and partners**: Additional good governance themes and partners will also be identified through the activities undertaken in the extension, where there will be an emphasis on building and sharing knowledge on the approaches to supporting demand and demand-supply side linkages of service delivery (see Activity II). GGP can be a platform (together with PRAN possibly) to invite and share experiences and issues with CSOs and other actors that could become the future partners of SDC in diversifying its engagement on the demand side and deepening its involvement with the supply side of service delivery. If the event is held at the mid-point of the extension year, there should be sufficient planning time left to extend demand side partnerships, or forge new supply side partnerships, without incurring a long programmatic gap.

168. **Clarifying the "supply side" intent of SDC**: SDC should be clear about the range of demand and supply side support that is relevant and requested. With respect to the supply side, it will need to determine how far it is willing to go toward the 2009-2012 Strategy for Nepal and its Good Governance Concept for Nepal. These two documents suggest a deeper involvement on the supply side than Pro Public has attempted to date through the "good Governance" portfolio. It can of course just use sectoral programming to insert itself in the supply side support. Regardless, it will need to assess potential partners for any such deeper involvement, and its own capabilities to partner on the new themes. Greater local government, service delivery, and public sector reform "programming" capacity would be needed by SDC than appears to be available at the moment. Partners would also need to have the requisite implementation skills.

169. **Coordinate with donors to determine cooperation or division of labour**: Recently the DP's Good Governance Working Group has been revived. Discussions in this forum could yield some ideas for new initiatives, or point to resource needs for ongoing initiatives (e.g., the LGAF, if this was to continue and require fresh funds).

170. The ERT tentatively suggests to ERT/DPs some new endeavours based on the discussions held with various stakeholders during the field work:

a. Focus on User Groups/User Committees – to increase accountability and efficiency, including determining criteria for using UG versus contractor modality
b. Security – e.g., risk assessment for VDC level – to address threats to security and encourage village secretaries to reside in VDCs where/when appropriate.
c. Economic development – supporting DDC to identify its potential and attract investment and develop local entrepreneurship and jobs.
d. APM support – to prepare local governance instruments (agreements/guidelines) that although not binding would have close to the moral force of bylaws. (e.g., animal movement, cleanliness, noise, garbage removal, service mapping, poverty mapping).

171. As key informants have cautioned, SDC will need to consider that there are not many potential national level partners. There are however many local NGOs, but these have highly variable capabilities. Working with INGOs appears to be difficult in view of recent government policies discouraging direct funding from donors to INGOs. This reality suggests that it may still be useful for SDC to work in a few districts, to make the scope of its work more manageable and felt. The experiences and models developed in these districts can then be channelled to the national level for adoption/adaptation on a larger scale. As the Project Director of LGCDP mentioned in the ERT debriefing, the SDC should consider full VDC coverage in its focus districts.

172. The district/bottom-up strategy should not close the door to national scope activities, such as establishing/supporting the GGCs federation. As the Good Governance Concept for Nepal states "Experience has shown that in the field of governance, a combination of top down and bottom up approaches and a mix of interventions on micro, meso and macro levels yield best results." SDC will want to see this dynamic within its portfolio, or at least contribute to an overall DP portfolio that reflects this principle.

Appendix 1- External Review Terms of Reference

Good Governance Project (GGP)

1. Background and description of project

The partnership with Pro Public (PP) for the implementing Good Governance Project started in July 1999 which continues to run in its 4th phase of cooperation. SDC's financial contribution was aimed at boosting Pro Public's endeavours to promote Good Governance in Nepal.

Some of the main reasons and understandings behind SDC's consideration to start contributing in this field were as follows:

After entering into new democratic era in 1991 the country was undergoing a number of democratic exercises like the promulgation of new constitution, election of new parliament, local election and was also enacting a number of laws for enabling the state to function in a democratic manner.

Governance being the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority in the management of country's affairs at all levels aims at improving public service delivery, economic growth and employment, rule of law and justice, safety, peace and protection of human rights and benefiting poor and disadvantaged people.

Active and empowered civil society can nourish and protect the democracy and decentralisation, Governance and transparency, the rule of law and human rights. This can also play an important role in the effective delivery of basic services to marginalised and discriminated people. The watchdog role played by a vibrant civil society can support in making the authorities accountable, answerable and can contribute in promoting transparency.

The then new democratic Government of Nepal had also recognized this potential role of civil society in creating public opinion and in pressurizing the political will to bring a visible improvement in managing public affairs. Government was committed to Decentralised Governance where Government expected active civil society participation. Civil society have therefore become an integral part of democratic governance and development in Nepal.

The rationale behind choosing Pro Public as partner for supporting in GGP was its involvement in promotion of Good governance and transparency (anti-corruption) and in protection of public interest through awareness creation, advocacy and litigation. The organization was run by a group of qualified, young and energetic professionals with a fairly well established system that showed potential to expand their program.

Good Governance Project

In the initial five years the project worked at national level gradually concentrating in 17 districts surrounding four regional centres (Dhankuta, Dolakha, Palpa and Surkhet) until 3rd phase and further focussing in the six Swiss cluster districts in phase IV for the project to be more effective and concentrated to support the local state building as guided by the Swiss strategy 2009-12.

The goal and purpose of the project during the first three phases between 1999 – 2009 was:

- enhancement of Good Governance in the organs of Government through creation of vibrant civic society

Key achievements in policy advocacy:

- Government of Nepal made the application of Public Hearing compulsory for government agencies and local bodies through a legal step 'Good Governance ordinance 2006'. GGP was invited to the ordinance drafting committee. This is a result of continuous advocacy and successful application of Public hearing and Public audit by GGP.
- The 'Public Hearing and Public audit guideline' for the Government was issued with the active involvement of the GGP.
- GGP was invited as active member in the Citizen Charter Drafting Committee of Supreme Court to draft citizen charter for judiciary.
- GGP's prominent role through advocacy and support was successful in making the Citizen charter compulsory for all Government offices and in local bodies.
- GGP played a prominent role in the drafting of Whistle Blower protection Bill, Good Governance Bill and Right to Information Bill.
- The Public Hearings in each cluster districts were able to get the consensus of the political parties for development activities through a public declaration.

Other outcomes and results achieved:
- *Peace initiatives:* Some 25 alliances of civil society NGOs that were formed to advocate peace and human rights at district level successfully intensified their peace campaigns.
- *Inclusive democracy:* The major political parties made their district structure more inclusive by adding number of seats for women, Dalit and ethnic groups.
- *Human Rights*: 211 families of IDPs (Internally Displaced Persons) were returned home and property of 23 families were returned by Maoists, 31 Human Rights abuse cases were monitored, 15 cases were filed, 17 families were rehabilitated as result of GGP intervention.
- Capacity of local partners: The local clubs and their coordination offices were able to conduct on their own a number Public Hearings and Public Audits in each cluster districts.
- Delivery of Government service: Increased use of Government services by the targeted beneficiaries in the focus districts as well as positive change in the responsive behaviour of Government authorities were reported in various publications.

In order to achieve the outputs and outcomes, GGP trains and orient the target beneficiaries and brings them closer to the service providers aiming to improve and facilitate the service delivery. The project on the other hand also plays a role of a watch dog and employs advocacy in monitoring and communicating the weaknesses in the delivery system to the service providers and to the government. The main instruments that are applied by the project are Public hearing, Public audit, training and Interaction program, Citizen Report Card, Help desks etc

The approaches & methodologies applied by the project were:
- ➢ Supporting the creation of CBOs called Good Governance Clubs and helping them to be organised in a district level Coordination committees of these clubs. There are today more than 6000 such clubs across country with a membership of more than 65'000 individuals
- ➢ Training these youths in advocating for Good Governance and in applying the advocacy instruments at district and village level.
- ➢ Providing funds (called as *local action fund*) to those clubs (CBOs) for applying the advocacy instruments at local level, until 3rd phase.

- Training Govt. service providers, VDC secretaries and local political actors on Good Governance, on advocacy instruments and responding to people's demands and voice for better service and on adherence to MoLD guidelines for Block grant use.
- Supporting Government line agencies to set up help desk in their office (at the door step)
- Create and/or join alliance of likeminded NGOs and CBOs in the district to intensify voice in demanding peace, human rights, transparency and Good Governance
- Join hands with National level constitutional bodies like NHRC, CIAA, OAG, PSC, at central level and DAO, DDC, and line agencies at district level

The Ongoing phase IV (2009- 2011) and its objectives;

The ongoing phase IV was considered as the final phase of SDC support to Pro Public for implementing GGP. During this phase, it was decided to concentrate in the six Swiss cluster districts (two in the far west and four in the central region) with the major objective of making Government behaviour more transparent and accountable resulting to a better delivery of services to disadvantaged people in these districts. At the same time the project was supposed to contribute local state building by focussing on strengthening the demand side of local governance.

Key achievements of current phase reported so far are:
- 50% increase in the use of government services by discriminated people in the project focussed area
- General public's level of satisfaction from govt services notably increased
- Local bodies (DDC & VDC) adopting the use of Public hearing approach as developed by GGP in responding to the concerns of beneficiaries and in addressing their demands.
- Threefold increase in the participation of discriminated people in the public events like; Public Hearing, VDC assembly, awareness and education programs etc.
- Positive response from local political actors and VDC secretaries visible through improved situation in following national guideline in allocating block grants for the poor, discriminated and other targeted beneficiaries.
- More than 60% of the questions, concerns and demands raised in Public hearing are addressed / resolved by concerned authorities.

Main remarks from past external reviews:
Positive remarks:
- GGP promoted participatory monitoring tools like PH-PA, CRC, Help Desk
- GG campaign of GGP highly accredited by stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Media program is successful in its objective and well received by all
- GG District Coordination Committees recognised and accepted by line agencies and by NGOs for networking
- GG clubs and their District Coordination committees are replicating most of GGP activities at local level
- Pro Public widely perceived as credible organisation

Challenges;
- Preconceived notion of "Government is corrupt" creates confrontation and provocative situation
- Inadequate professionalism and lack of interest of GGP and PP in monitoring outcomes and outputs – reports mainly done on activity level

- Lack of proper documentation system and inadequate capacity in information management
- Inadequate follow up and monitoring
- Difficult to meet deadlines in the implementation of planned activities
- Weak internal Governance
- Lack of Coordination among Pro Public's projects

2. Purpose of the review

The purpose of this review is to assess the achievements of the Good Governance Project in terms of its relevance, effectiveness and sustainability in achieving SDC's strategic outcome and to recommend SDC on how it can continue governance activities in future.

3. Main Issues for the external review

3.1   The organisational strength vis a vis the Changes in the project's priorities

According to Pro Public's mission statement the organisation is dedicated to play the role of social change agent to empower Nepali people through research, capacity building, advocacy and awareness generation.

The Goal, purpose and deliverable outputs of the project in the initial stages up to 3rd phase were very much in line with the organisations area of engagement. The project was quite innovative in bringing new ideas and tools and was rated to be success it's delivery in achieving the expected results like in; preparations of critical stakeholders, promoting a vibrant civic society, building capacity of stakeholders (youth and general public) to advocate for Good Governance and transparency.

Starting from phase III, to be in line with changed SDC's strategy GGP was required to shift its focus from advocacy and creating public voice and demands to supporting the delivery side as well by providing training, educating, monitoring and providing constructive feed back to service providers. This shift in priority was to support the local state building in Nepal that required partnership with duty bearers and more of cooperative behaviour from the side of the project.

SDC's assessment of GGP including the last review result indicated that the project that was successful in developing and applying advocacy instruments and in preparing a critical mass at all levels was not equally able to achieve the same level of success in supporting development endeavours of Government and of projects and monitoring the delivery aspects.

SDC therefore would like to know if this shift was demanding a contradicting role from what Pro public is known for? Can these two functions be continued by a same organisation like Pro Public? The end result of the project being improvement in the delivery of services by the state to disadvantaged group of people should SDC be considering a change or a mix in partnership? Is it necessary to have both the approaches (strengthening demand and supply side) going together for achieving the project's outcome or a strong focus in one would do better.

Questions:

a) How is the GGP/Pro Public performance with regards to delivery both the roles. Have they been equally successful in both or are there any short comings? If there are some limitation, what are they? And how can they be addressed?

b) How far and where the learning's of decade long implementation of GGP have been institutionalised?

3.2   Internal Governance

SDC's principles on partnership expects the partner organisation to adhere to basic elements of Governance like; Transparency, accountability, Sound Internal control system, inclusion and diversity, conflict sensitiveness, political impartiality, technical and social competency and good monitoring and reporting practice.

As a result of recommendations of last reviews and SDC's follow-up some attempts to address the issues were made by Pro Public like: Abolishing the practice of double hat (holding position in executive board and employee) by keeping possibility of consultancy jobs, a bit of expansion in the general membership to give some impression of inclusiveness, improvement in workforce diversity at the project level, transparent process of auditor selection and change of auditor.

The suggestions to Pro Public in this regards included:
-   administrative reform and organisational development bringing contextual changes
-   introduction of uniform project operation system, policy, rules and regulations to discourage the parallel structure within the organisation (projects and Pro-Public) and for applying uniform rules and conditions for staff working within the organisation.
-   make Pro Public an inclusive, membership based organisation by changing the membership policy and also consider providing membership to some GG clubs and their coordination committees created and capacitated by PP as network partners in districts.
-   revisit the 10 yrs perspective plan of PP to come up with a strategic plan of Pro Public with result indicators
-   improve documentation of achievements and learning's and introduce reporting system to report on outcomes and outputs at the organisation level
-   hold meeting of PP's donors on an annual basis to see complementarities, harmonisation possibilities and also in view of capitalising the achievements – attracting more donors.

SDC is interested to know about the seriousness of Pro Public in improving the governance within the organisation and in creating a conducive environment for partnership.

Questions:
   a) What has so far been done by Pro Public to improve its internal governance including coordination and inter-relation between GGP and Pro Public?
   b) What are the further minimum milestones that needs to be adopted by Pro Public before SDC could consider continuing with this organisation in future?
   c) What is the social competency of PP and of GGP in dealing and addressing the social matters within the staff, organisation and with its stakeholders?
   d) What are the specific skills related modules inbuilt in the governance training manuals, so the staff can learn and apply do-no-harm approach, minimise the risks of exposing themselves and dealing with potentials threats?
   e) What are the measures and mechanisms available at PP and GGP to deal with staff issues for example, maintaining work-family relationships, sexual harassment, burn-outs and gender and inclusion specific needs?
   f) How do duty bearers (CDOs, LDOs) feel about GGP? And why? What can be improved and whether it can be done by GGP?
   g) How far is the staff prepared to deal with conflicts arising and how far is the staff coached, supervised to deal with conflicts
   h) How far is the institution PP, GGP aware of the social competences needed to be able to work in the field

3.3 Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability

Though, not unnatural, many of the duty bearers dislike GGP both at national and the district level for very obvious reason. As usually is the case, the watch dog and advocacy project/ organisation are not very popular among the duty bearers. This alone would not have been a great issue of concern, have PP/GGP been only a whistle blower programme, it also needs to deliver certain things together with the duty bearers. In such a case, it becomes difficult for the project to change hat and seek a partnership relation in supporting the delivery mechanism of the service providers (supporting through training, implementation of guidelines, application of participatory instruments by duty bearers etc).

Similarly, the tools and methodologies used by GGP to gather information was highly questioned. In one such instance, the application of citizen report card was heavily criticised by stakeholders. The criticism was mainly on data collection, sampling and analysis methods. SDC perceived the sort of situation can be counterproductive for the overall development and delivery by the agencies that are being supported by one or other SDC project in the district. Therefore, second major concern for SDC in its final phase is validation of its research and analysis methodologies and improving its communication strategy with the duty bearers. The consultant will need to validate the reports of GGP.

While validation of the results of this phase of the project is important, the question of its sustainability is equally vital. It is not only important to validate project's effectiveness and efficiency in the context of more than a decade long support from SDC, but it is also important to ascertain the reliability of methodology used while finding and communicating the deficiencies of the local governance system.

Questions:
  a) How far are the project's approaches been effective in contributing to SDC's strategic outcome 2.2 *(Local governments deliver effectively development services in respond to demands and aspirations of citizens especially DAGs in Swiss cluster districts)*
  b) Has the activities of GGP made the service delivery by the DDC, VDC and the line agencies in the district it works more effective? How?
  c) How has it helped LGCDP activities to be more effective?
  d) Has its monitoring and reporting on DDC/VDC block grant guidelines made a difference? Are these reports consistent?
  e) Are the project's approaches including tools and instruments relevant in achieving SDC's strategic outcome and Local State Building?
  f) How are the results/learning's validated, communicated, internalised and institutionalised?
  g) What has been the role of GGP in supporting other SDC funded projects in the district to perform/achieve their local state building outcomes? How has been the role of GGP to support other SDC project's in adopting to the Good Governance practices?

3.4 Looking forward

The activities of Good Governance Project are still important for SDC in achieving its strategic outcomes. Therefore SDC wants to engage in raising the Good Governance issues particularly in the context of local state building. At the same time SDC believes that the capacitating of duty bearers to make them accountable as well as the support in capacitating the beneficiaries in claiming their rights are important attributes of Good Governance. Support and cooperation with other SDC projects in institutionalising the attributes of good governance is expected.

The assessment of further support requirement in the changed context where new development partners are coming with the new programs and approaches (PRAN of world bank, LGAF of LGCDP) is important to be known for possible synchronisation and coordination.
The proposed review is expected to provide recommendations on the need of change in approach, instruments and partnership modality in view of new context and priorities of SDC.

Questions:
    a) Which of the approaches of Good Governance should SDC continue to achieve its strategic outcomes 2.2? Which could be the best tools and instruments?
    b) What may be the best suitable partnership approach in view of future engagement of SDC in Good Governance?
    c) In the context when LGAF has also been commissioned, what are the added value that GGP can bring? After LGAF, will GGP still be relevant?

4   Methodology

- Review of project documents, yearly operational plans, outcome monitoring reports, progress reports, selected GGP publications, GG Radio programme contents etc.
- Review SDC documents such as SDC Strategy 2010 and the Governance Concept Nepal
- Interviews with key stakeholders, partners, target beneficiaries (both in centre and field level) including GG District Coordination Committees, GGP staff in districts, civil society and local government bodies (VDCs & DDC) and line agencies particularly CDO, DADO, DEO and DHO and also with the project management and Pro Public.
- Meet and consult with other donors and projects – DANIDA, PRAN, LGCDP, LGAF, CIDA, PASRA (GIZ) etc.
- analysis of data, information and report writing
- briefing on findings and recommendations at SDC Kathmandu
- presentation of a final review report

5   Deliverable
The review is to provide free and frank commentary on the issues and concerns listed above. This review shall provide professional views and analytical feed back with recommendations to SDC. The report of the review should be structured into:
- Executive summary
- Findings
- Conclusions
- recommendations

The report is expected to bring substantial inputs and advice in deciding, designing and steering of SDC's future possible support in promoting Good Governance and local state building.
The report should be short and precise.
The preliminary findings should be presented and discussed in SDC on ...March 2011.

6   Composition of External Review Team
The review team will consist of 2 consultants including one lead consultant. If required the consultant team can conduct a sample survey in advance before the start of the External Review itself.

Both the consultants must have a sound professional background in the areas of governance and democracy. They must have in depth knowledge about the functioning of local states and of the decentralization process in Nepal.

7   Timing (tbd)

The external review will be carried out during the period March 3–23 2011. The following activities with tentative schedule is foreseen:

Study of documents and preparatory works	2 days
Meetings, visits (interviews in KTM)	2 days (4th, 5th March)
Field visit to 2 districts and VDCs	11 days (6-17th March)
Consolidation of data, information and report writing	2 days
Debriefing, presentation of findings and discussion	1 day
Compilation editing and finalisation of report	2 days
Total days foreseen	20 person days

8   Reference documents

- Project document 2009-12, project agreement
- YPOs, Progress Reports
- GGP Publications, bulletins,
- Organisational and functional charts and internal policy documents of Pro Public
- SDC country programme, SDC Governance Concept
- Other relevant documents upon request

Appendix 2 – GGP Results Based Logical Planning Matrix

Results Chain	Indicators	Source of Verification	Risk/Assumption
Goal: People exercise their democratic rights and benefit from public goods and services	• Public service providers comply with the Good Governance Act • DAGs have used the resources allocated to them in government plans and programs	• Citizen satisfaction survey report LSG monitoring report of GG-DCC	Local Self Governance (LSG) mechanism comes in effect.
Outcomes			
1. People, in particular the disadvantaged, are capable to claim benefit from development interventions	• At least 60% DAG population in project districts use services provided by the education, health and agriculture offices and by VDC block grant • Increase participation of disadvantaged people in PH/PA from the present 20% to 50% in the project focus area (*districts*) • Composition of village and district councils in project focus area (*districts*) is inclusive in accordance with the national guidelines. • Attendance in public events is representative (DAG and the rest) of the demography of the area. • VDC's annual plan and budget adopt national provision and guidelines regarding budget allocation for DAG • CA members and other actors who visit project districts receive inputs from discriminated groups during the consultation meetings in districts and villages	• Monitoring report of GG-DCC • VDC Block grant • PH/PA attendance record • VD council member list • List of input provided to CA during consultation meeting	Government agencies and local bodies willing to cooperate with NGOs. Existing government policy towards NGOs remain favourable Guidelines for DDC-VDC budget allocation is available CA and legislative process not delayed.
2. Local Government Offices and service providers are accountable to people	• 60% public service recipients in the project districts are satisfied with services provided by at least 5 selected government offices (Education, Health, Agriculture, Land revenue, District administration) • VDCs in the project focus area *(districts)* conduct at least one PH and/or PA beginning from 2010 • Grievances raised by people in public events are responded on time by local bodies / line agencies in project districts • People in the project districts, receive public service as prescribed in the 'Government Service Directives' and as per LGCDP provisions (Funds allocated to VDC, Budget allocation according to demand side…)	• Citizen Report Card survey report • DDC/VDC annual report, • Citizen satisfaction survey report • PH-PA report • CCP (citizen Complaint Platform) report • Monitoring report of GG-DCC	Govt. line agencies extend their cooperation Local bodies and Government officials show interest in GGP program

Results Chain	Indicators	Source of Verification	Risk/Assumption
Outputs to Outcome 1			
1.1 People are aware of government programs and service standard	• PH declarations are available and the monitoring mechanism for fulfillment of declarations is in place • 60% of DAGs know about targeted program (Agriculture, Health, Education) • DAGs in 25 VDCs in each project focus districts are trained to write proposals	• Monitoring report on PH • Monitoring report on Govt. service delivery	Resources are allocated by Govt service providers for disadvantaged people
1.2 People are sensitized of civic rights and responsibilities towards the state and society	• Reduction in the case of Govt offices being padlocked • Reduction in the number of schools closure days due to protests and strikes in the project districts • Reduction of the cases of transport closure due to protest	• Comparison of progress data & baseline data	Sister organisations of political parties show cooperative attitude
1.3 Local youths, clubs and user group members have knowledge about the application of GG advocacy and monitoring tools	• 70% of trained Local youths/club members/user groups organize at least one of the GG advocacy and monitoring tools in 25 VDCs in each district • GG Clubs send periodic monitoring report to GGP on participation, transparency and quality maintenance in local infrastructure activities in 25 VDCs in each project focus district • GG District Coordination offices receive regular reports on monitoring and follow-up of the group's activities in 25 VDCs	• VDC/GGC report • Monitoring report	Right to Information act is enforced Access to information in infrastructure dev. is available
1.4 Discriminated groups are aware of the constitution making process	• At least 20% of discriminated people in project focus areas have received and discussed the draft constitution • 50% of the participants in the meetings with CA members are from discriminated groups	• GG-DCC report • Participant list	
Outputs to outcome 2			
2.1 Officials of Local bodies and government line agencies are skilled in responding public remarks and questions	• 80% Government officials from at least 5 front line office are trained in Good Governance advocacy instruments and Govt service guidelines • VDCs and DDCs conduct annual PH / PA and follow declarations	• List of participants • PH monitoring report	Local bodies are functional
2.2 The officials in local government and line agencies are sensitised to timely communicate their plans/programmes,	• At least 60% service seeking people are aware of local government/line agencies' plan, programs and resources. • Citizen charters are updated and compliance monitored	• CRC report • Citizen charter and opinion survey • Minutes of interaction meeting	

Results Chain	Indicators	Source of Verification	Risk/Assumption
resources and implementation to the people			
2.3 DDC receive the input from people on the implementation of LGCDP in the project district	• DDC organises events (twice a year in district HQ and five events a year in villages) to discuss the issues related to the implementation of LGCDP in the project district • 50% of rural citizens in the project focus VDCs know about the provisions and plans of LGCDP	• Report on interaction and events • Attendance register • Radio reports	Draft constitution widely disseminated

Appendix 3 – Comments on LPM

Results Chain	Indicators	ERT Comments
Outcomes		
1. People, in particular the disadvantaged, are capable to claim benefit from development interventions	i. At least 60% DAG population in project districts use services provided by the education, health and agriculture offices and by VDC block grant ii. Increase participation of disadvantaged people in PH/PA from the present 20% to 50% in the project focus area (*districts*) iii. Composition of village and district councils in project focus area (*districts*) is inclusive in accordance with the national guidelines. iv. Attendance in public events is representative (DAG and the rest) of the demography of the area. v. VDC's annual plan and budget adopt national provision and guidelines regarding budget allocation for DAG vi. CA members and other actors who visit project districts receive inputs from discriminated groups during the consultation meetings in districts and villages	i. Total DAG population in VDCs of focus not known by GGP; how use is defined is not set; how it is tracked sectorally not clear, or what range for VDC funded activities ii. Not clear how disadvantaged DAG (reduced to discriminated group) is counted in PH/PA (participants as percentage of total DAG population in the area or proportion of DAG attending the PA/PH); not clear what the PA refers to – projects of VDCs? What is the baseline figure from? iii. Could be monitored but does not seem to be iv. Need to know the "area" for each public event (all public events?) and the demography for each area v. Could be tracked, and for Ramechhap may have been, but it is not a required template for GGP, so data is unlikely to be available to HQs. vi. Activity relating to CA should be dropped
2. Local Government Offices and service providers are accountable to people	vii. 60% public service recipients in the project districts are satisfied with services provided by at least 5 selected government offices (Education, Health, Agriculture, Land revenue, District administration) viii. VDCs in the project focus area *(districts)* conduct at least one PH and/or PA beginning from 2010 ix. Grievances raised by people in public events are responded on time by local bodies / line agencies in project districts x. People in the project districts, receive public service as prescribed in the 'Government Service Directives' and as per LGCDP provisions (Funds allocated to VDC, Budget allocation according to demand side…)	vii. Citizen Report Card survey report not completed in all districts; mix of district offices and dispersed service centres is problematic (not all fit "public service recipient label). Not appropriate to use for longitudinal comparisons. viii. More relaxed and ambiguous than the relevant output ix. "On time" not clear (according to declarations? What if no timetable set?) and mechanism to track not adequate x. Not operational (clarification adds to confusion)

Results Chain	Indicators	ERT comments
Outputs to Outcome 1		
1.1 People are aware of government programs and service standard	a. PH declarations are available and the monitoring mechanism for fulfillment of declarations is in place b. 60% of DAGs know about targeted program (Agriculture, Health, Education) c. DAGs in 25 VDCs in each project focus districts are trained to write proposals	a. Some PH declarations are available (e.g., by Secretaries and GGP Coordinators), but no consistent and applied mechanism to track fulfillment, .especially a locally rooted mechanism b. Not tracked or trackable given # of DAGs not known in all VDCs; meaning of "know" unclear and untested c. Appears to be happening and is reported, though the impact may be highly variable (should not expect illiterate segments of DAG to write proposals!)
1.2 People are sensitized of civic rights and responsibilities towards the state and society	d. Reduction in the case of Govt offices being padlocked e. Reduction in the number of schools closure days due to protests and strikes in the project districts f. Reduction of the cases of transport closure due to protest	d. Data source is unclear (not in baseline). Validity dubious since many other factors in play; also may show opposite trend if good governance is seen as informing workers of their rights. In GGP reports it is measured in days instead of "cases" e. See "d" except for days vs. cases aspect f. See "d"
1.3 Local youths, clubs and user group members have knowledge about the application of GG advocacy and monitoring tools	g. 70% of trained Local youths/club members/user groups organize at least one of the GG advocacy and monitoring tools in 25 VDCs in each district h. GG Clubs send periodic monitoring report to GGP on participation, transparency and quality maintenance in local infrastructure activities in 25 VDCs in each project focus district i. GG District Coordination offices receive regular reports on monitoring and follow-up of the group's activities in 25 VDCs	g. The training appears to be done, but the follow-up seems to only be tracked for GGCs, not other participants; the formulation is in any case confusing. h. Does not appear to happen; even some focus VDCs do not have active GGCs. In any case, there is no format/guidance for such periodic monitoring it seems. i. Same issues as found for "h" above
1.4 Discriminated groups are aware of the constitution making process	j. At least 20% of discriminated people in project focus areas have received and discussed the draft constitution k. 50% of the participants in the meetings with CA members are from discriminated groups	j. Activity not undertaken due to lateness of CA's work (also not very relevant; should not have been planned for YOP 3) k. Activity not undertaken due to lateness of CA's work (also not very relevant; should not have been planned for YOP 3)
Outputs to outcome 2		
2.1 Officials of Local bodies and government line	l. 80% Government officials from at least 5 front line office are trained in Good	l. The overall number of front line officials does not seem to be recorded, and indications are that the

Results Chain	Indicators	ERT Comments
agencies are skilled in responding public remarks and questions	Governance advocacy instruments and Govt service guidelines m. VDCs and DDCs conduct annual PH / PA and follow declarations	training was rather haphazard in terms of ensuring the right candidate selection. Fewer than 80% is likely to have been trained. m. Not clear if on their own, or if GGP organized events count; declarations tracking is not done in all LBs, nor is it fully tracked by GGP. It is not tracked in general by citizens/CSOs.
2.2 The officials in local government and line agencies are sensitised to timely communicate their plans/programmes, resources and implementation to the people	n. At least 60% service seeking people are aware of local government/line agencies' plan, programs and resources. o. Citizen charters are updated and compliance monitored	n. CRC report not yet available in at least Dailekh; CRC confuses service seekers with employees issues (in case of DEO at least). o. No monitoring mechanism to check if updated and no definition of what it means to monitor compliance. Not clear why charters have to be updated.
2.3 DDC receive the input from people on the implementation of LGCDP in the project district	p. DDC organises events (twice a year in district HQ and five events a year in villages) to discuss the issues related to the implementation of LGCDP in the project district q. 50% of rural citizens in the project focus VDCs know about the provisions and plans of LGCDP	p. Seems to be happening to some extent. Will be less relevant as the block grant is merged into regular grant. q. Definition of rural unclear; total population unclear, and terms not operationalized (know, provisions, plans) – not clear where data is to come from to answer this indicator.

Appendix 4 – List of relevant documents for the ER

Broad Topic	Document
Program Planning/ Guidance	Pro Public GGP Project Proposal to SDC December 8, 2008
	Yearly Operational Plan 2009/10 , overall and by district
	Yearly Operational Plan/budget 2010/11 Spreadsheet
	Yearly Operational Plan 2011/12 , overall and by district
	Project Steering Committee meetings
SDC documents	SDC Strategy 2010
	SDC Governance Concept Nepal
Financial Reports	Financial report, summarizing two years
	Audit?
Program progress/outcome monitoring reports	Semi-annual Progress Report 2009
	Annual Progress Report 2009/10
	Semi-annual Progress Report 2010
	Annual Progress Report 2010/11
	Output Monitoring Report 2009/10
	Self-Evaluation GGP 2008
	Organogram for GGP
PMF	Approved PLM
	Baseline/targets report for PLM
GGP training manuals, cases studies, good practices, other outputs	GG radio programming?
	GGP Bulletin (Nepali)
	GGP provided 29 points recommendations to LGCDP on 1 November 2009

Appendix 5 – Schedule of the ER

DATE	Activity	Purpose
March 3	• Travel to Kathmandu • Briefing with local consultant (Arun Adhikary) and SDC project office (Madhu Sharma)	• Obtain orientation to the assignment • Plan for next days' meetings
March 4	• Meeting with SDC team • Meetings with GGP PD and staff • Meeting with Pro Public Ex. Dir.	• Share review plans, gain overview of project and key documents
March 5	• Travel to Nepalgunj and then on to Dailekh • Discussion with District Coordinators	• Dailekh is one of the selected districts for the ER • Gained over view of GGP in the district from coordinators
March 6	• Separate meetings with: Coordinators, LDO, GGCDCC, DEO, Good Governance Club members, Political Parties	• Discuss role of GGP, support received, benefits gained, good governance efforts/needs of stakeholders
March 7	• Meeting with CDO • Travel to Badlamji, Dulu and Padhuka VDCs for meetings with local officials and CSOs/citizens	• Obtain his view of government receptiveness to public hearings, and GGP. • Discuss GGP and good governance efforts/needs in these VDCs
March 8	• Meeting with VDC secretaries • Travel to Nepalgunj	• Discuss GGP and good governance efforts/needs in these VDCs
March 9	• Meeting with GGCDCC • Reflection and gleaning of key findings	• Obtain information and views on effort to create a GGC federation at national level • Identify what ERT knows and what remains to be ascertained/plan for upcoming Kathmandu days
March 10	• Travel to Kathmandu • Meeting with Madhu Sharma • Meeting with Parnav, Deputy Project Director of GGP	• Discuss preliminary findings from the field and planning for Ramechap field visit Discuss Monitoring Indicators and framework with GGP at Pro Public
March 11	• Dinesh Thapaliya and Gopi Krishna Khanal (LGCDP) • Manoj K. Bhattarai, CD Officer, LGAF (Chakupat, Lalitpur) • Richard Holloway, World Bank PRAN Coordinator • Pro Public with Board members	• Benefits and links to LGCDP of GGP activities • Opportunities with LGAF for GGP/GGCs • Basic information on PRAN and views of WB on demand side/supply side support • Internal governance issues as seen by Pro Public board
March 12	• Travel to Ramechhap district • Meeting with GGP.	•
March 13	• Information Officer Ramechhap DDC; District Facilitator/LGCDP • Meeting with CDO	•

DATE	Activity	Purpose

	• Meeting with Line Agencies
	   o DADO
	   o DEO	

March 14	• DAG meeting • Ogreni VDC	• Discuss GGP and good governance efforts/needs in these VDCs
March 15	• Kathjor VDC • Travel to Dolakha • Shankar Bahadur Thapa, LDO Dolakha • CDO, Dolakha • GGP and GGCDCC: Deepak Basnet, Jeeran Lama, Sher Bhadur Bhujel	• Obtain views from VDC level actors • Understand how phase out occurred and sustainability prospects from Dolakha experience (ended in Dec. 2010)
March 16	• Travel to Kathmandu	•
March 17	• Meeting with Lars Peter of Danida • Meeting with Ramesh Shrestha of GIZ-PASRA	• Learn more of the approaches used by other donors, and the perceptions of where SDC can add value.
March 18	• Day off – as per contract terms	•
March 19	• Report writing	•
March 20	• Report writing • Meeting with Pro Public • Meeting with SDC program officer	• Testing of some findings and conclusions with SDC/Pro Public
March 21	• Briefing with SDC	• Formally convey the findings/recommendations of the ER Team
March 22	• Briefing with Pro Public/GGP	• Formally convey the findings/recommendations of the ER Team
March 23	• Submission of final report • Travel home for Gabe	•

Appendix 6 – Persons met in External Review

Kathmandu SDC and Pro Public
Elizabeth von Capeller - Counsellor (Dev.) Head of Cooperation SDC
Sandra Bernasconi – Second Secretary (Dev.) Assistant Country Director SDC
Madhu Sharma – Project Officer, SDC
Pramod Kumar Jha, Pro Public President of the Board (Executive Committee)
Tul Hari, Pro Public General Secretary of the Board (Executive Committee)
Prakash Mani Sharma – Executive Director Pro Public
Kedar Khadka – Project Director, GGP
Pranav Bhattarai Asst. Project Director GGP
(7 other project staff)

LGCDP/LGAF
Dinesh Kumar Thapaliya – Joint Secretary MLD
Gopi Krishna Khanal (LGCDP)
Manoj K. Bhattarai, CD Officer, LGAF (Chakupat, Lalitpur)

GGP District Coordinators (Dailekh and Jajarkot)
Hari Prasad Adhikari (Dailekh and Jajarkot)
Nirmal Adhikary (Dailekh)

Political parties (Dailekh)
Ram Bdr. Thapa – Jansakti Party
Shivray Dahal – Madjur Kishan Party
Rang Bdr. Tamang – National Janmareka
Krishna pd. Jaisi – Maoist
Barunath Yogi – UML

GGCDCC Board members (Dailekh)
Nirmal Adhikary
Deepak Acharya
Crhanshyam Bhandari
Dil Bhadur Nepali
Sarita Thapamagar
Manju Nepali
Mahendra Bhadrea

Sidasthali GG Club
(Chair and 5 members; two women)

DAG members (Dailekh)
Amar Sunar – Chairman Dalit Awareness Centres
Ramesh B.K. – Chair NNDS
Sita Rijal– Chair Women Network
Padam Sunar – Chairman Dalit Self-Society
Parbati Bisunke – Chairman FEDO

Surya B.K. – Chairman Dalit Sewa Sang
Government Officials (Dailekh) Chief District Officer
Ram Prasad Pandey – Local Development Officer
Nanda Lal Pandel – District Education Officer
Section Head, DEO

VDC visits/VDC staff in Dailekh
Kathmandu meeting:
Gyememdra Jung Shah – Secretary, Rawotkot VDC
Bal Bahadur Thapa – Secretary, Baganath VDC
Amvita Kumari Ramjali Magar – Secretary, Naumoole VDC
Site visit to Badlamji VDC (not a focus VDC):
Premban Sanyaji – VDC Secretary Badlamji VDC
Technical assistant and three citizens – Badlamji VDC
 Site visit to Dulu VDC (focus VDC):
ADO, Secretary, Health Post, Post Office, Forestry, School teacher, DAG, GG Club and citizens
(about 20; 5 women)
Site visit to Paduka VDC:
Secretary (Bhaktiban Sanyasi), Health Post, School teacher, DAG, GG Club and general citizens
(26 participants, half women)

Good Governance Club – NepalGunj (Banke)
Namaskar Shah, Director BAS, and 5 other members (two women)

VDC Secretaries (Ramechhap)
Dhal Bahadur Karki; Manthali and Sonarpani VDCs
Pream Bahadur Shrestha; Chisapani VDC
Kul Bikram Shrestha; Viopani VDC
Ram Hasi Adhikari; Phulasi and Poiti VDCs
Kausal Jang Thapa; Khadaderi, Bethan, and Khaniyapani VDCs
Janardan Bikram Karki; Bhadauli and Makadum VDCs
Kesar Bahadur Khatoi; Kathajor VDC

DAG (Ramechhap)
Nabaras Pathik (Reporter AV News)
Bichar Smg Tameng (Chair Janajati Federation)
Rajendra Dangal (Coordinator NNDSWO)
Sita B.K. (Member of Women's Human Rights Federation)
Januki Shrestha (Chair RBPW)
Fanindra B.K. (Chair NNDSWO)

District officials (Ramechhap)
Chief District Officer
Dipak Kafle - District Education Officer
Bikas Poudel Acting District Agricultural Development Officer
Dipak Subedi - Information Officer – DDC
Pragyan Gemiri - District Facilitations Officer - LGCDP

Political parties (Ramechhap)
Ananda Shrestha –UCPN UML
Lohk Kardi – NC
Keshar Kuner UPCN Maoist

Okhreni VDC (Ramechhap)
23 participants (5 women); VDC Secretary, Service Centre representatives, political parties representatives, DAG/citizens.

Kathjor VDC (Ramechaap)
13 participants (one woman); VDC Secretary, political party representtives, DAG

GGP/GGCDCC (Ramechhap)
GGP: Ramesh Dhungel (DC)
GGCDCC: President, Vice-president, Secetary, Treasurer

District officials (Dolakha)
Chief District Officer
Shankar Bahadur Thapa - Local Development Officer

GGP/GGCDCC (Dolakha)
Deepak Basnet (Coordinator, GGCDCC chair), Jeeran Lama (Assistant Coordinator) , Sher Bhadur Bhujel (Assistant Coordinator)

Appendix 7 – Assessment of the Baseline Report for GGP

General:

The killer weakness in the report is that the questions asked/data provided do not correspond closely with the indicators of the LPM. In fact, the LPM of GGP does not seem to be referred to as the specific frame of reference; the baseline then being one point in time, to be followed by further measurements periodically. The indicators therefore do not match well, or at all, and the methodology is not one that would have been amenable to periodic updating. The methodology is also not sufficiently clear in terms of the sampling frame, and the tables offering the findings do not add much on this issue. The DAG portion of the sampling frame in particular is cloudy. The representativeness of the selected VDCs is also unclear.

Specific:

- Services obtained from local based government offices (Table 1-7): no match in the LPM

- Knowledge about goods and services provided (Tables 8-14): relevant to GGP but categories are not the same ("Know" of LPM is not found in the responses) and the respondents are the general population it seems (LPM requires DAG, see 1.1b))

- Frequency of visits (table 15-21): no match in the LPM

- Knowledge about service provision for marginalized groups (Tables 22-28): not clear if marginalized groups are DAG. Data is provided by service centre, for each district; there is no method given for how to condense the averages to obtain one value, as required for 1.1b) of the LPM (would need to be weighted by DAG population of each focus set of VDCs, assuming the baseline sample was representative of all focus VDCs). This condensing issue is faced in many other indicators, but is not mentioned if other weaknesses are more determining.

- Attitudes towards various aspects of service (Tables 29-52): no match in the LPM

- Satisfaction with different local based government offices (Tables 53-59): This comes close to being useful, as it is near to the 2.a) indicator of the LPM, but the Satisfied in the LPM is broken into Satisfied and Fully Satisfied in the baseline (could be aggregated though), and the baseline is broken down by service agency and district; would need guidance on how to properly condense these into one value.

- Involvement of DAG in different functions of local based government offices (Tables 60-74): this looks close to 2.2 a) but cannot be matched because the LPM calls for service seekers (baseline is general) and LPM is for all service seekers, whereas the baseline is for DAG.

- Knowledge about public accountability tools (Tables 75-109): no match in LPM

- Knowledge about annual plan, program, budget (Tables 110-116): closer to 2.2 a) of LPM, but still issues of service seekers versus the general sample of baseline.

Appendix 8 – Financial summary and variances - first two years of GGP

Output ref.	Budget Headings	budget 2009/2010 Amount NRs.	budget 2010/2011 Amount NRs.	budget first two years Amount NRs.	budget 2011/2012 Amount NRs.	Budget Total Amount NRs.	Actual 2009/2010 Amount NRs.	variance %	Actual 2010/11 Amount NRs.	variance %	budget first two years Amount NRs.	variance %
1.1	Public Hearing (PH) at District Level	600,000	600,000	1,200,000	600,000	1,800,000	536,024	- 11	543,922	- 9	1,079,946	- 10
	Public Hearing at VDC Level	480,000	960,000	1,440,000	960,000	2,400,000	851,390	77	887,083	- 8	1,738,473	21
	Monitoring of PH declaration	100,000	200,000	300,000	150,000	450,000	43,150	- 57	200,035	0	243,185	- 19
	Training - Orientation of DAG groups	1,500,000	2,000,000	3,500,000	1,000,000	4,500,000	946,144	- 37	1,885,159	- 6	2,831,303	- 19
	Interaction - Interface between VDC, service provider & DAG	300,000	300,000	600,000	300,000	900,000	243,872	- 19	1,054,984	252	1,298,856	116
	Dissemination of Service Directives	150,000	250,000	400,000	180,000	580,000	161,281	8	376,682	51	537,963	34
	Citizen report card survey	120,000	120,000	240,000	120,000	360,000	35,396	- 71	105,000	- 13	140,396	- 42
	GG progr in Dhankuta & Palpa for one year (phase out district)	1,800,000	-	1,800,000	-	1,800,000	1,674,318	- 7	-	-	1,674,318	7
1.2	Baseline Survey	500,000	-	500,000	-	500,000	450,000	- 10	-	-	450,000	- 10
	Interaction program (students, Political Parties)	90,000	120,000	210,000	60,000	270,000	104,667	16	72,765	- 39	177,432	16
	Education and avocacy + materials	130,000	130,000	260,000	110,000	370,000	198,901	53	276,210	112	475,111	83
1.3	Training on GG Advocacy	1,200,000	1,200,000	2,400,000	1,200,000	3,600,000	1,011,531	- 16	1,112,282	- 7	2,123,813	- 12
	Monitoring and follow-up program	360,000	400,000	760,000	320,000	1,080,000	161,113	- 55	388,000	- 3	549,113	- 28
1.4	Dissem. of Draft Constit. & meetings with DAG	100,000	100,000	200,000	50,000	250,000		-		-	-	no spending
2.1	Training of Gov staff, VDC on Gov instruments	1,200,000	1,500,000	2,700,000	900,000	3,600,000	1,026,524	- 14	1,217,888	- 19	2,244,412	- 17
	Follow up training	140,000	280,000	420,000	420,000	840,000	-	-	-	-	-	no spending
	Training Manual and materials	190,000	150,000	340,000	90,000	430,000	145,360	- 23	91,525	- 39	236,885	- 30
2.2	Collaborative action with VDC (plan)	250,000	350,000	600,000	300,000	900,000	115,047	- 54	124,862	- 64	239,909	- 60
	Interaction (LA/DDC-service delivery)	120,000	240,000	360,000	240,000	600,000	110,443	- 8	12,015	- 95	122,458	- 66
2.3	Collaborative action on LGCDP, Distr+ centre	500,000	800,000	1,300,000	700,000	2,000,000	284,203	- 43	597,329	- 25	881,532	- 32
	Media advocacy (Radio, Bulletin, Local FM)	2,700,000	2,400,000	5,100,000	2,200,000	7,300,000	2,402,632	- 11	1,859,431	- 23	4,262,063	- 16
	GG district office support (6 focus dist+ surkhet)	5,950,000	5,950,000	11,900,000	5,800,000	17,700,000	5,580,130	- 6	7,428,435	25	13,008,565	9
1 & 2	**Project office (KTM) cost**					-						
	Salaries	5,000,000	5,100,000	10,100,000	5,200,000	15,300,000	4,710,391	- 6	5,103,729	0	9,814,119	- 3
	Consultancy (planning, monitoring, training, SE, Review)	200,000	400,000	600,000	800,000	1,400,000	207,062	4	13,697	- 97	220,759	- 63
	Materials (as per replacement need)	270,000	200,000	470,000	200,000	670,000	236,555	- 12	323,800	62	560,355	19
	Travel and Transport (field visit cost)	1,000,000	1,200,000	2,200,000	1,100,000	3,300,000	708,783	- 29	954,195	- 20	1,662,978	- 24
	Office running cost (rent, utility, communication, audit)	1,700,000	1,700,000	3,400,000	1,700,000	5,100,000	1,554,673	- 9	1,740,000	2	3,294,673	- 3
	Yearly and Total Budget in NRs.	**26,650,000**	**26,650,000**	53,300,000	**24,700,000**	**78,000,000**	**23,499,588**	- 12	**26,369,027**	- 1	49,868,616	- 6
	Budget for Project Implementation in CHF	410,000	410,000	820,000	380,000	**1,200,000**	361,532	- 12	405,677	- 1	767,209	- 6